



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

HISTORY
OF THE
CHRISTIAN CHURCH

UNIFORM WITH THIS VOLUME.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

A.D. 1-600.

By the late DR. WILLIAM MOELLER.

Translated by ANDREW RUTHERFURD, B.D.

1892.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Characterized by all the thoroughness that marks most of the productions of German scholars. A distinct advance on Kurtz."—*Review of the Churches*.

"To say the least entitled to rank with the very best works of the kind."—*Bookman*.

"The orderly, consecutive, readily apprehensible statement we have no hesitation in saying that the book is a great improvement on the manual of Kurtz, the work with which it most invites comparison. . . . Thorough knowledge, clear method, lucid statement, a power of seizing and distinctly exhibiting the main points in a period or movement—these are the qualities which are likely to put it in the front rank among our text-books of Church History."—*Critical Review*.

"This work furnishes a much needed *desideratum* to students of early Church History."—*Religious Review of Reviews*.

"The book is a text or hand-book, and the best of its kind we are acquainted with."—*Modern Church*.

"The place which Dr. Moeller's History was sent to fill was unfilled till it came. It is a student's volume, the kind of book which a student delights in, loves to handle, loves to conquer and know."—*Expository Times*.

"To the teacher who wants references, to the priest or minister who wants to keep up his theological library, to the public librarian who wants to be able to send his inquirers to a practical and scientific authority, and to be himself directed to the choice of the best books on the subject, as well as to the student, this book may be heartily commended."—*Manchester Guardian*.

M

HISTORY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN CHURCH

IN THE

MIDDLE AGES

BY
THE LATE DR. WILHELM MOELLER

Professor Ordinarius of Church History in the University of Kiel

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY
ANDREW RUTHERFURD B.D.



48117
15/5/00

LONDON
SWAN SONNENSCHN & CO.
NEW YORK: MACMILLAN & CO.

1893

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xi
CHURCH HISTORY OF THE MIDDLE AGES.	
FIRST OR TRANSITION PERIOD.—FROM GREGORY THE GREAT TO CHARLEMAGNE.	
INTRODUCTORY SURVEY	1-2
FIRST DIVISION. THE GREEK CHURCH	3-29
CHAPTER FIRST. THE GENERAL CONDITION OF THE GREEK CHURCH AND ISLAM	3-7
CHAPTER SECOND. THE MONOTHELETE CONTROVERSY	8-10
CHAPTER THIRD. THE SECOND TRULLAN COUNCIL	11, 12
CHAPTER FOURTH. THE IMAGE CONTROVERSIES	13-17
CHAPTER FIFTH. THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CHURCH	18-21
CHAPTER SIXTH. EMINENT REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GREEK CHURCH IN MONASTICISM AND THEOLOGY	22-25
CHAPTER SEVENTH. THE PAULICIANS	26-29
SECOND DIVISION. THE WESTERN CHURCH	30
CHAPTER FIRST. CHRISTIANITY AMONG THE GERMANIC TRIBES FROM THE FIRST BEGINNINGS DOWN TO 600 A.D.	30-41
1. The Goths	30
2. The Arianism of the Rest of the East Germanic Tribes and Kingdoms and the Ostrogothic Kingdom in Italy.	33
3. The Relations between the Germanic and Arian Conquerors and the Catholic Romans	35
4. The Franks, and the Victory of the Catholic Creed among the Burgundians, Suevi, and Visigoths	36
CHAPTER SECOND. THE VISIGOTHIC CHURCH IN SPAIN, FROM THE TIME OF RECCARED'S CONVERSION, AND ISLAM	42-44
CHAPTER THIRD. CHRISTIANITY IN THE BRITISH ISLES	45-55
1. The Ancient British Church	45
2. Patrick and the Irish-Scottish Church	46
3. The Anglo-Saxon Church and its relation to the Ancient British and the Irish-Scottish Churches	49
CHAPTER FOURTH. THE FRANKISH KINGDOM AND MISSIONS IN GERMANY BEFORE BONIFACE	56-66
1. The Irish-Scottish Mission in the Frankish Kingdom, and in Alamannia	56
2. Bavaria	60
3. Thuringia	61
4. The Mission among the Frisians	62
CHAPTER FIFTH. THE INTERNAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE FRANKISH CHURCH TILL THE APPEARANCE OF BONIFACE	67-73
CHAPTER SIXTH. BONIFACE	74-83
CHAPTER SEVENTH. ITALY, THE POPES, AND THE FRANKISH POWER	84-93
THE SO-CALLED DONATION OF CONSTANTINE	92
CHAPTER EIGHTH. THE CHRISTIANIZATION OF THE SAXONS; BEGINNINGS OF THE SLAVS AND AVARS	94-98
CHAPTER NINTH. THE FRANKO-GERMAN CHURCH IN THE TIME OF CHARLEMAGNE; THE ORDER, HIERARCHY, AND GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH	99-108
CHAPTER TENTH. THE MONASTIC SYSTEM	109, 110
CHAPTER ELEVENTH. POPULAR LIFE IN THE CHURCH	111-121
1. Conflict with Heathen Superstition	111
2. Divine Worship	112
3. The Penitential System	114
4. Influence of the Church on Legal Life	118
5. Preaching and Instruction in Penance	119

CHAPTER TWELFTH. THE LEARNED AND THEOLOGICAL CULTURE OF THE WEST, FROM GREGORY THE GREAT TO CHARLEMAGNE . . .	122-126
CHAPTER THIRTEENTH. THE PARTICIPATION OF THE FRANKISH CHURCH IN THE MOVEMENTS OF THEOLOGY	127-132
1. The Image Controversy	127
2. The Controversy on the Procession of the Holy Spirit	129
3. The Adoptionist Controversy	130
SECOND PERIOD.—FROM CHARLEMAGNE TO THE MIDDLE OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.	
SURVEY OF THE GENERAL CONDITION OF THE WORLD	133-135
CHAPTER FIRST. THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY	136-154
1. The Northern Mission	136
2. The Moravian Mission	142
3. The Bulgarians	146
4. Bohemia	147
5. Conversion of the Wends	148
6. Poland, Prussia and Hungary	149
7. Chazars and Russians	152
CHAPTER SECOND. THE PAPACY AND THE HIERARCHY.	155-188
1. The Popes, the Church, and the Frankish Monarchy, till after the middle of the Ninth Century.	155
2. The Revolution in the Conceptions of Ecclesiastical Law.	159
3. The Papacy and the Hierarchy under Nicholas I. and his Successors, Hadrian II. and John VIII.	164
4. The Papacy and the Hierarchy down to the Deposition of John XII. in 963	172
5. The Papacy, the Ottos, and the French Church till the death of Otto III. and Gerbert	178
6. From the Death of Sylvester II. to the Synod of Sutri	183
CHAPTER THIRD. MONASTICISM	189-193
CHAPTER FOURTH. CHRISTIAN CULTURE AND SCIENCE	194-209
1. The Ninth Century	194
2. The Characteristic Doctrinal Controversies of the Time of Charles the Bald	201
1. Controversy on the Eucharist, 201. 2. On the <i>partus virginis</i> , 203. 3. The Gottschalkian Controversy, 203.	206
3. The Tenth and the First Half of the Eleventh Century	210-221
CHAPTER FIFTH. ECCLESIASTICAL LIFE	210-221
1. Christian Instruction	210
2. The Church and Divine Worship.	211
3. Worship of Saints and Relics	214
4. Penitential Discipline and the Papal Jurisdiction	217
CHAPTER SIXTH. THE GREEK CHURCH FROM THE END OF THE IMAGE CONTROVERSIES TILL THE SCHISM OF 1054	222-242
1. Relation to the Latin Church	222
2. The State of Ecclesiastical Affairs	230
3. The Literary and Theological Development	233
4. The Sects Hostile to the Church.	237
a. Paulicians and Thondrakians, 237. b. Euchites and Bogomiles, 239.	
THIRD PERIOD.—FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY (THE BEGINNING OF THE INFLUENCE OF HILDEBRAND) TILL THE DEATH OF BONIFACE VIII. IN 1303. THE FLOURISHING PERIOD OF THE PAPACY AND THE MEDÆVAL ECCLESIASTICAL SYSTEM.	
INTRODUCTION	243-247
CHAPTER FIRST. THE HISTORY OF THE PAPACY AND ITS RELATION TO THE EMPIRE AND THE SECULAR POWER IN GENERAL	248-291
1. The Papacy and its Reforming Efforts under the Influence of Hildebrand—1073	248
2. The Pontificate of Gregory VII.	255

	PAGE
3. Gregory's Successor and the Investiture Controversy, down to the Concordat of Worms	261
4. The Succeeding Popes till 1154, and Arnold of Brescia	266
5. Popes Hadrian IV. and Alexander III. and the Hohenstaufen, Frederick I. Barbarossa.	269
6. The Papacy, from the Death of Alexander III. to that of Innocent III.	274
7. The Papacy in Conflict with Frederick II. and the Fall of the Hohenstaufens	279
8. The Papacy till the Death of Boniface VIII.	286
CHAPTER SECOND. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH	292-320
1. The Books of Canon Law	292
2. The Rights of the Pope	294
3. The Relation of the Papal Church to the Secular Power, and the Geographical Expansion of the Papal Church Government	299
4. The Social Relations of the Clergy	305
5. The Influence of the Hierarchy on Legal Life	311
6. The Internal Relationships of the Clergy	314
7. The Priestly Celibacy of the Clergy	315
8. Canonical Life. Augustinian Canons; Victorines; Premonstratensians	317
CHAPTER THIRD. POPULAR LIFE IN THE CHURCH. THE CHURCH'S MEANS OF EDIFICATION AND DISCIPLINE	321-345
1. Preaching	321
2. The Sacraments	326
3. Worship of Saints and Relics	331
4. Confession and the System of Indulgence	337
CHAPTER FOURTH. THE DEVELOPMENT OF MONASTICISM DOWN TO INNOCENT III.	346-360
1. The Older Orders	346
2. The Order of Grammont	348
3. The Carthusians	349
4. The Order of Fontévrault	349
5. The Cistercians	350
6. The Brothers Hospitallers	353
7. The Knightly Orders	354
a. Johannites, 354. b. The Templars, 356. c. Order of the German House, 358.	
CHAPTER FIFTH. THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE NORTH AND EAST	361-367
1. The Christianizing of the Slavs	361
2. The Baltic Provinces	364
3. Prussia	366
CHAPTER SIXTH. THE HISTORY OF THE SCIENCES TILL THE END OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY.	368-381
INTRODUCTORY NOTE.	368
1. Berengar and Lanfranc	368
2. Anselm of Canterbury.	370
3. Abelard and Gilbert	374
4. Bernard of Chartres and William of Conches	376
5. Bernard of Clairvaux and the Victorines	377
6. The Church Dialecticians	378
7. Reactions against the Modern Theology	379
8. Alanus ab Insulis	381
CHAPTER SEVENTH. THE SECTS HOSTILE TO THE CHURCH	382-403
1. Manichees, Enthusiasts, Henry, Petrobrusians, Apostolics, Cathari	382
2. The Waldenses. Beginnings. Humiliates. Pauperes Catholici. Further Development of the Waldenses	391
3. The Conflict with Heresy. The Albigensian War. The Inquisition	398
CHAPTER EIGHTH. THE MENDICANT FRIARS	404-421
1. The Franciscans	404

	PAGE
2. The Second Order of S. Francis	407
3. The Order of S. Dominic	408
4. The Penitential Brotherhoods of the Mendicant Orders	410
5. The Activity and Conflicts of the Mendicant Friars	412
6. The Internal Conflicts in the Franciscan Order and Joachimism	416
CHAPTER NINTH. THE SCHOLASTICISM OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.	422
1. The Expanded Resources of Science	422
2. The New Form of the Pursuit of Science: the Universities	423
3. The Fortunes of Aristotle in Paris. Amalric of Bena and David of Dinant	426
4. The Older Great Schoolmen of the Thirteenth Century	427
5. Averroism	432
6. Raymond Lull	433
7. Johannes Duns Scotus.	434
CHAPTER TENTH. THE ASCETIC AND MYSTICAL PIETY OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.	436-438
CHAPTER ELEVENTH. THE GREEK CHURCH	439-444
1. The Internal Affairs of the Greek Church	439
2. The Relations of the Greek Church to the West.	442
FOURTH PERIOD.—THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES.	
CHAPTER FIRST. THE AGE OF THE FRENCH PAPACY	445-478
1. The Papacy at Avignon	445
2. The Fall of the Templars	451
3. The Conflicts in the Franciscan Order	455
1. The Community and the Spirituals. The Fraticelli. 2. The New Controversy on Poverty. The Observants.	
4. The Advance of Anti-papal Theories on the Spiritual and Secular Powers	460
5. The Revolution in Scholastic Theology	464
6. German Speculative Mysticism since Eckart	468
7. The Mystical Pietism of the Friends of God	472
8. The Beguines (Beguini, Beghardi, Beguinæ) and the Sect of the Free Spirit	475
CHAPTER SECOND. THE TIME OF THE WESTERN SCHISM AND THE GREAT COUNCILS.	479-522
1. The Schism, the Reforming Councils of Pisa and Kostnitz, and the Papacy till the Death of Martin V.	479
2. The Aggravated Ecclesiastical Abuses under the Schism.	486
3. John Wiclif and the Lollards	490
4. Reforming Movements in Bohemia before Hus	497
5. The Brothers of the Common Life	499
6. Professional Theology in the Age of the Schism and the Reforming Councils	503
7. John Hus	505
8. The Hussites	510
9. Eugenius IV. and the Council of Bâle	514
10. The Greek Church, the Florentine Union, and the Fall of the Byzantine Empire	519
CHAPTER THIRD. THE TIME OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL REACTION AND THE RENAISSANCE	523-552
1. The Papacy from the Middle of the Fifteenth Century till the Reformation	523
2. Humanism and the Secular Culture of the Renaissance	531
3. The Theology of the Second Half of the Fifteenth Century	536
4. Attempts to Reform Morals in the Church.	537
5. Some Features of Religious Life.	540
6. The Issues of the Sectarian Movements, the Waldenses and Bohemian Brethren.	547
APPENDIX	551
INDEX	555
CORRECTIONS	561

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

ABA.	}	=Abhandlungen der Bairischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
ABAW.	}	
ABG.		=Abhandlungen der kgl. böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissensch.
ADB.		=Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie.
AGG.		=Abhandl. der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.
AKOG.		=Archiv. f. Kunde österr. Geschichtsquellen.
ALKG.		=Archiv für Litteratur u. Kirchengeschichte by Ehrle and Denifle.
AOeG.		=Archiv für östreich. Geschichte.
ASB.	}	
ASBol ^l .	}	=Acta Sanctorum Bollandistica.
ASGW.		=Abhandl. d. sächs. Gesellschaft d. Wissensch.
BIV.	}	
BLV.	}	=Bibliothek d. litterarischen Vereins, Stuttgart.
Bouquet.		=B. recueil des historiens des Gaules.
BPLugd.		=Bibliotheca maxima Patrum Lugdunensis.
DZG.		=Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft.
Erschu.	}	
Gruber	}	=Allgem. Encyclopädie.
FDG.		=Forschungen z. Deutschen Geschichte.
FRA.		=Fontis rerum Austriacarum.
GGA.		=Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen.
GDV.	}	
GSddV.	}	=Geschichtschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit.
GQ.		=Geschichtsquellen.
Hefele		=Conciliengeschichte (1-6 in 2nd ed.; vol. vi. by Knöpfler; continued by Hergenröther).
HJb.		=Historisches Jahrbuch, Münchener.
HZ.	}	
Sybel	}	=Sybel's Historische Zeitschrift.
HZ.	}	
HTB.		=Historisches Taschenbuch by Raumer and his continuators.
Jaffé,	}	
Jaffé	}	=Regesta Pontificum Roman. ed. Jaffé.
Reg.	}	
Jaffé	}	=Jaffé, Bibliotheca rerum germanicarum (I. Monumenta Corb. II.
Br. G.	}	Mon. Gregor. III. Mon. Mogunt. IV. Mon. Carol. V. Mon. Bam-
	}	berg. VI. Mon. Alcuin.)
Jbddd	}	
R.	}	=Jahrbücher des deutschen Reichs.
JbdddR.	}	
JGG.		=Histor. Jahrbuch d. Görresgesellschaft.
Jd Th.		=Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie.
Jpr Th.		=Jahrbücher für protestant. Theologie.
KL ² .		=Wetzer und Welte, Kirchenlexicon, 2nd edition.
Mabill	}	
AS.	}	=Mabillon Acta Sanctorum.
MabAS.	}	

Mansi	=Mansi conciliorum amplissima collectio.
MG.	=Monumenta Germaniæ.
MGL.	=Monum. Germ. Leges.
MGS.	= " " Scriptores.
MGEp	= " " Epistolæ.
MGEp 13	= " " XIII. sæculi.
MG	} = " " auctores antiquissimi.
auct.	
antiq.	} = " " Poetae latini medii ævii.
MG	
poetae.	} = " " Poetae latini medii ævii.
l. m. æ.	
MG	} = " " Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum.
scr. r.	
Langob.	} = Migne Patrologiæ cursus completus ; Series graeca.
Mgr.	
MI.	= " " " " Series latina.
MJOG.	=Mittheilungen des Instituts f. österr. Geschichte.
NA.	=Neues Archiv.
NF.	=Neue Folge.
Oncken	=Oncken, Allgem. Weltgeschichte in Einzeldarstellungen.
Poth.	} =Potthast, Regesta Pontificum.
Pott-	
hast.	} =Real Encyclopädie, 2nd ed.
RE.	
RQH.	=Revue des questions historiques.
SBA.	} =Sitzungsberichte d. Bairischen Akademie d. Wissensch.
SBAW.	
SBWA.	=Sitzungsberichte d. Wiener Akademie d. Wiss.
SBrA.	= " " Berliner " " "
Scr. eccl.	} =Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum lat. Vindobon.
lat.	
ScrG.	=Scriptores rerum Germanicorum in usum scholarum.
Scr.Br.	=Scriptores rerum Britannicarum.
StK.	=Studien u. Kritiken.
ThLBl.	=Theolog. Literaturblatt.
ThLZ.	=Theol. Literaturzeitung.
ThQ.	=Theol. Quartalschrift.
Vok Th.	=Vierteljahrsschrift, österr., f. kathol. Theologie.
Wttb.	} =Wattenbach, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter, 5th ed.
Wattb.	
ZdA.	=Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum.
ZDMG.	=Zeitschrift d. deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch.
ZfGw.	=Zeitschrift f. Geschichtswissenschaft.
ZhTh.	=Zeitschrift f. histor. Theologie.
ZKG.	=Zeitschrift f. Kirchengeschichte.
ZKR.	=Zeitschrift f. Kirchenrecht.
ZlTh.	=Zeitschrift f. lutherische Theologie.
ZWL.	=Zeitschrift f. kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben (Luthard).
ZWTh.	} =Zeitschrift f. wissenschaftl. Theologie.
ZwTh.	

CHURCH HISTORY OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

First or Transition Period.

FROM GREGORY THE GREAT TO CHARLEMAGNE.¹

Introductory Survey.

THIS period witnesses the infinitely important laying of the foundations for the history of the Germano-Roman Middle Ages and of modern times, in which the centre of gravity of the Christian movement is transferred to the Roman West. The Greek Empire, pressed hard on every side, has now only weak supports in the West, and is already weakened by incessant conflicts with the Neo-Persian Empire, and shaken to its depths and robbed of whole provinces by Islam, while, at the same time, it has to defend itself against the Slavs, Bulgarians and Avars. Internally, the state with its despotic and bureaucratic government, oppressed by taxes, is lacking in healthy powers of political life; the Church, although the most independent power in the Empire, amid growing intellectual torpidity and increasing dependence on the Byzantine rulers, shows itself less and less capable of real regeneration. The possession of the inherited treasures of learning and dialectic-dogmatic training on the one hand, and on the other hand, the monkish spirit of piety, still ripen outstanding ecclesiastical personages; but the necessary connection between faith and morality is more and more dissolved under the orthodoxy of the state-church. The want of intellectual productivity more and more prevents men from undertaking dogmatic work proper, and the multitude more and more accustoms itself to regard ritual (or the cult), along with the maintenance of ecclesiastical orthodoxy, as the real substance of religion. The image controversies shake the Church to its depths.

¹ In the case of the Greek Church this period, for the sake of connection, goes down to the close of the image-controversies (828). In the case of the Western Church, it goes back to the beginnings of Christianity in the Germanic world, which took place before this period.

In the **West**, on the other hand, rude forces rule ; but the Catholic Church, in possession of the means of civilization, has here entered on its vocation of educating the peoples. It does indeed appear at first, as though the Christian civilized life of this Germanic Empire (Visigoths, Franks, Lombards) erected on Roman soil, after a short development, were rushing upon a speedy dissolution, to give place once more to the old confusion. The rude German force, poisoned by the corrupt Roman civilization, consumes itself in wantonness and wild passion. The Visigothic Empire advances towards its fall, to sink under the inrush of the Arabs. Even in the Frankish Empire, along with unbridled moral corruption, increasing barbarism prevails, under which, in the seventh century, the last traces of ancient Roman civilization seem to disappear. At the same time it was just here that the most powerful germs of life were present, which were not again to be lost. Missionary activity, proceeding from the British Islands, scatters anew the Christian seed, influences the Church of the Frankish Empire and lays the foundations of Christianity in Germany and Friesland. The mission to the Anglo-Saxons, the work of Gregory the Great, provides a powerful factor in Christian civilization. Hence proceeds Winfried (Boniface), whose activity coincides with a new great rise in the prosperity of the Frankish kingdom under the Pepinids, and also results in that thorough permeation of German political life with the ordinances of the Roman Church, on which rests the further history of the Christian West. But, at the same time, the old bonds which linked the Roman Church with the Byzantine Empire are more and more relaxed, and instead of the latter, the Papacy finds itself, in its perplexities, directed towards the young Franco-German power. The Papacy and the Frankish Empire seek and find each other, and thereby found one of the greatest epochs of the history both of the Church and of the world.

FIRST DIVISION.

The Greek Church.

Sources: THEOPHANES Confessor, *Chronographia*, ed. (Paris 1655, and Classen, Bonn 1839 sqq.) De BOOR, Lipsiæ 1883-85; Ibid. in vol. 2: ANASTASII Bibliothecarii *Historia tripartita* (also Ml. 127-129) which mainly depends on Theophanes.—*Liber pontificalis* (vid. i. p. 295).—NICEPHORUS Cpl. *Breviarium rerum post Mauriciū gestarum* ed. Im. Bekker, Bonn 1837. For the first half of the ninth century: GEORGHII monachi dicti HAMARTOLI, *Chronicon* ed. de Muralto, Petropoli 1859. JOS. GENESIOS, *De reb. Constpl.* (Mgr. 109, 901), who, at the instigation of the Emperor Constantine VII. Porphyrog., wrote the history of the Emperors from Leo V. Arm. down to Basilus Mac.; and the first books of the continuator of Theophanes (ed. Bonn 1836), who worked up the material provided him by the same Emperor, including Genesius also. Cf. HIRSCH, *Byzantinische Studien*, Leipz., 1876.—CHRONICON PASCHALE, vid i. 20 and 340. EUTYCHII AL. *Annales* ed. et vert. Pococke, Ox. 1658.

Literature: LE BEAU, *Hist. du Bas-Empire*, new ed. by Saint-Martin and Brosset, Paris 1824 sqq. GIBBON, *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Chapp. 46-52.—HERTZBERG, *Geschichte der Byzantiner*, Berlin 1883. (W. Oncken, II. 7).

CHAPTER FIRST.

The General Condition of the Greek Empire.

1. THE internal weakness of the Empire, still concealed by the brilliancy of the reign of Justinian, had become obvious immediately after his death in 565. Italy, which had scarcely been wrested again from the Goths, had since 568 in greater part fallen into the possession of the Lombards. From the North the Avars pressed in, from the East the Persians, as under Chosrau I. (*Gr.* Chosroës) Nushirvan against Justin II., so again under Chosrau II. Parviz (591-628), who in the time of the Emperor Phocas (602-610) desolated all the Asiatic provinces of the Empire, then in the time of Heraclius conquered Jerusalem (614) and pressed forward as far as Chalcedon. Heraclius indeed from 621 victoriously opposed him in long wars, and in the end compelled his son Shirujeh (= Siroës, also called Kobad II.), who had overthrown his father, to make peace, and brought back the wood of the Cross which the Persians had stolen (*Festum exaltationis sanctæ*

crucis, 14th September). Now, however, there increased not only the attacks from the side of the Slavonic tribes, who settled in Dalmatia, Illyria and Mœsia, and thence pressed into the Balkans and Macedonia, threatened the important Thessalonica and far into Epirus and Thessaly, and even, under pressure of the Bulgarians, who had settled behind them (679), came as far as the Peloponnese. But a worse enemy had meanwhile appeared: **Mohammed**.

2. Islam.

Literature: A. SPRENGER, *Das Leben und die Lehre Mohammed's*. 3 vols. Berlin 1861 sqq. L. KREHL, *Mohammed's Leben*, Leipz. 1884. The Koran, Arab. and Germ. by FLEISCHER, 1841; Germ. by ULLMANN, 3rd ed. 1844. G. FLUEGEL, *Gesch. der Araber*, pp. 2nd ed., 1861. WEIL, *Gesch. der islamit. Völker*. Stuttgart 1866. A. v. KREMER, *Kulturgesch. des Orients unter den Chalifen*. 2 vols. 1875.

The **Arabs**, a people full of natural vigour, under the simple and even rude conditions of their life as shepherds, robbers, and nomads, rich in fancy, gifted in speech and poetry, clung to their ancient heathen nature-religion (worship of the stars with numerous tribal and family idols). They had their national sanctuary in the Kaaba (Alkaaba = the cube) in the infertile Mecca, which, however, pilgrimages had made a place of trade; it was guarded by the honoured tribe of the Kureish. From ancient times, however, they were influenced partly by Judaism and partly by Christianity as well. Signs of religious fermentation are to be observed even before Mohammed, if not a formally monotheistic sect, at least monotheistic tendencies; men who sought after a new faith or, rather, after the ancient faith of Abraham.¹

Mohammed was born about 570 at Mecca, of the tribe of the Hashemites, who were themselves poor, but related to the most esteemed tribes. He was early an orphan, and grew up in poor circumstances, till, when he was twenty-five years of age, he married the rich widow Khadijah. He was of a nervous, highly excitable nature, very accessible to ecstatic notions, which took form in hallucinations. Powerfully seized by the idea of a strict and exclusive monotheism, it was, however, only after long wrestling among visions and dreams that he grasped his divine mission and (according to tradition) first appeared as a prophet when forty years of age, but now adhered to his vocation with tenacity and decision. In Mecca itself he found but few adherents and much opposition, even in his own family; he, however, formed alliances in **Yathrib** (after-

¹ KREHL, *Religion der vorislamitischen Araber*. Leipz. 1863.

wards Medinat annabi, *i.e.* the city of the prophet, or simply **Almedina**, *i.e.* the city), which finally led to the famous flight thither (Hijrah, Hegira), from which the Mohammedan chronology is reckoned.¹ From Medina as a centre he combated the Meccans, with an ever increasing number of adherents and in alliance with neighbouring tribes; many joined in these wars without any deeper assent to his doctrine. After Mohammed, by treaty with Mecca, had obtained the right to visit the national sanctuary to which he clung, by an unexpected seizure, he placed himself in possession of Mecca almost without conflict, purified the national sanctuary from the images of the gods, and thereby placed it—a mighty instrument!—at the service of his new religion. With his growing power Mohammed did indeed adhere in many points to the plain habits and manner of life of his people, but gave himself up more and more to the life of the harem. He had finally eleven wives, while to his believers he allowed only four. To his original, powerful religious impulses, there were linked shrewd and crafty calculation on the attainment of his purpose of dominion. **The idea of the purification of the natural religion was gradually transformed into that of a conquering world-religion which at the same time united its adherents politically.** The fundamental idea is the restoration of the purified patriarchal religion of Abraham (the progenitor also of the sons of Ishmael), pure monotheism, of which Abraham, Moses and Jesus were also recognised as the prophets. At first especially he kept in view the relationship with Judaism,² and with Christianity with which he was but scantily acquainted, and placed great hopes on the Jews. But their repellent attitude, which would have nothing to do with his vocation as prophet or Messiah, so much the more sharpened the opposition. In general, however, his earlier and non-exclusive judgment, to which all who believe in **one** God and in divine retribution seemed to be of spiritual kinship, subsequently gave place to the exclusive attitude of Islam as the only true religion, although he still continued to recognise a distinction between the confessors of the one God, who have writings, *i.e.* Holy Scriptures, and the heathen. This monotheism combats along with all heathenism, all **idolatry** also, and turns emphatically against the

¹ The day of the flight itself is the 12th or 13th June, 622; but the Mohammedans reckon from the beginning of the first Mohammedan month of the year (1st Muharram) in which the flight took place, *i.e.* 12th or 13th July, 622.

² On the influence of traditional doctrines of Judaism on Mohammed *vid.* SPRENGER ZDMG. xxix. 1875, p. 655, and HIRSCHFELD, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Koran.* Leipz. 1886.

Christian belief in the Trinity and the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. To the Christian conception of the union of God and man, the mystery of the incarnation and atonement, he opposes the abstract transcendency and unity of the Almighty who is exalted over all. The religious fundamental demand of **unconditional submission to the will of Allah** asserts itself in two directions, (1) as fanatical devotion to his service in the conquest of the world for his faith, (2) as absolute submission to the will of God and the lot by Him appointed. With this is connected the **fatalistic disposition** which in the Koran itself is by no means as yet logically developed. But the religious relation of man to God is somewhat externally conceived as the fulfilment of certain religious duties (*viz.* prayers, fasts, washings, alms, pilgrimages and the holy war); over against it there stand the prospect of Paradise, decked out with sensuous fantasy, as the reward of the believer, and the prospect of judgment for the unbeliever. His views of morality, however, in many respects only express the dominant national practice. As the religious prophet at the head of the believers now becomes at once the source of civic regulation of justice and the leader in war, there is developed the peculiar, spiritual as well as secular, dominion of the Caliphs. At first, Islam recognises no clergy; but before long a Mohammedan monasticism.

For the development and strengthening of Islam, the written religious original record, the **Koran** (lecture), was of the greatest importance. The individual fragments of revelation, spoken by Mohammed and expressly declared to be revelation¹ (*suras*, *i.e.* lines) were immediately written down by his adherents, but only gathered together after his death by Abu Bekr. They were spoken on various occasions; hence also many later utterances corrected many earlier. The copy which was recognised by OTHMAN, the third Caliph after Mohammed, is regarded as authentic. On the basis of the Koran there was soon developed a Mohammedan scriptural learning, which in its legal and casuistical character forms a counterpart to Jewish Rabbinism. Thus in it also, alongside of the letter of the Koran there appears the **Sunna** (rule, preserved by oral tradition). Hence, however, there arose a permanent difference. Mohammed had been succeeded by ABU BEKR, who was on close personal relations with him, next by OMAR, and then by the Muawiad OTHMAN. After the fall of the latter, a return was made to Mohammed's adopted son and son-in-law, ALI, who now became the successor in the office of Imam (the Caliphate). The one party now declared the three pre-

¹ He does not by any means so designate all his religious utterances.

ceeding Caliphs, as also the Ommeyyads, to be illegitimate, and hence the Sunna attested by them (not the Sunna in general) to be invalid (Shiites¹ in opposition to the Sunnites).

Within the Mohammedan religion there appears further, and especially in the Persian region, in opposition to the legal doctrine of the Koran, the mystico-theosophic tendency of **Ssufism**. The deterministic conception of absolute Omnipotence here receives a turn towards pantheism, which allows those who tend to mysticism to be absorbed in the Godhead and emancipates them from the rigour of legalism.

The great irresistible course of conquest of the Mohammedan Arabs already directed itself under the first three Caliphs against both the Persian and the Greek Empires, ruined the former and robbed the latter of many provinces. Jerusalem fell in 637, Antioch in 638, Egypt, where the Monophysite Copts, separated from the Church of the Empire, met the Arabs as emancipators, in 640. Then followed North Africa, as far as Ceuta. The three oriental patriarchates were thus torn away from the Greek Empire. Christianity and its ecclesiastical institutions were indeed tolerated here under more or less oppressive and humiliating conditions—Christians as well as Jews were obliged to pay the poll-tax—but Christianity, which, independently of these facts, had already become so external and torpid, fell more and more into degradation, and numerous conversions prepared its gradual extinction in large districts of country.

¹ The distinction was properly between Shiia, *i.e.* Shiat Ali (Adherence to Ali), and secondly people of the Sunna (adherents to the actually existing Caliphate), and thirdly Kharejites *i.e.* the rebellious, with the principle: the rule ever belongs to the best.

CHAPTER SECOND.

The Monothelete Controversy.

Sources : Besides Theophanes, Anastasius Bibliothecarius and the Liber Pontificalis, the Epistles and Acts of the Roman Lateran Synod and the Sixth Œcumenical Council, Mansi X. 868, XI. 187, where also Anastasii Bibl. *Collectanea ad Johannem Diaconum* (Ml. 129, 553) and MAXIMI *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*; in addition various writings of Maximus ed. Combef. II. (Mgr. 91, 1). ANASTASIUS Presbyter in A. Mai *Script. vet. nova Collectio* 7, 193 sqq.—L. FRANZ. COMBEFISIUS *Historia Monothelitarum*, in his *Auctar. nov. bibl. patr.* Paris 1649, II. 3.—WALCH, *Ketzergeschichte*, IX.—HEFELE, III. 121.

THE loss of the great Monophysite party (vid. i. 422), which from the time of Justinian confirmed itself with ever increasing decision in its schismatical attitude, was deeply felt by the Byzantine Empire and the Emperors; under the very conditions of the character of the Byzantine institution of the state-church, it involved a political danger, as was afterwards shown on occasion of the Mohammedan conquest of Egypt, in the attitude of the Monophysite Coptic populace,¹ as against which the "Melchitic," i.e. imperial party of the state-church (*a potiori* the Hellenic) was in a vanishing minority.

The wish of the Emperor HERACLIUS, to reconcile the Monophysites with the Church and the Chalcedonian doctrine recognised in it, by means of concessions, brought about new strife. Heraclius, counselled by SERGIUS the Patriarch of Constantinople, discussed the matter, on his Persian campaign of 622, with PAUL, the representative of the Armenian Monophysites.

Union was sought by means of the formula, that Christ indeed consisted of two natures, but wrought things divine and human through the instrumentality of **one** divine-human manner of working (*μία θεανδρική ἐνέργεια*). Bishop CYRUS of Phasis (Colchis), raised to the see of Alexandria and at the same time equipped with the authority of a secular official, as a matter of fact, with this formula and an interpretation of the Chalcedonian doctrine approaching as nearly as possible to the Monophysites, gained a great part of

¹ On the attitude of Sophronius of Jerusalem *vid.* K. Schenk's conjecture, in *Zur Geschichte der Bilderstreitigkeiten*. Halle 1880, p. 8.

the Monophysites, especially of the moderate party (Severians) and persecuted those who more obstinately resisted. ATHANASIUS, the head of the Syrian Monophysites, was likewise won, and recognised as Patriarch of Antioch.

But opposition soon arose to this formula as a sacrifice of the doctrine of the Church to the Monophysites. It was especially the monk SOPHRONIUS (who soon afterwards became Patriarch of Jerusalem) whose decided opposition caused the Patriarch Sergius, now in alliance with the Roman Bishop HONORIUS, to advise the hushing up of the controversy by the non-use of the formula of **one** or **two energies** of the God-man, and to fall back on the impartially presupposed unity of the **will** in the person of the God-man. Accordingly the imperial **Ekthesis** (638) forbade controversy on these expressions, likewise presupposing the unity of the will, and indirectly favouring the doctrine of a divine-human manner of working. Syria and Egypt, the chief seats of Monophysitism, were lost to the Mohammedans, but the controversy continued. The monk MAXIMUS, protected by Gregorius the Procurator of Africa, who was on a very strained footing with the Byzantine Court, appeared as the most important theological force on the side of the doctrine of two wills and manners of working as the logical outcome of the Chalcedonian doctrine, and the Patriarch PYRRHUS (the successor of Sergius), who had fled from Constantinople on political grounds, allowed himself to be won over to that view in a disputation (*Disput. Maximi cum Pyrrho*, one of the most important documents in this controversy) and therefore formally retracted Monotheletism in Rome (for a short time, till he soon afterwards under altered conditions made his peace with Byzantium). The Emperor Constans II., in the **Typos** (648), under threats of severe penalties, now commanded adherence to the expressions of the older teachers of the Church, and cessation of strife over the controverted propositions (which were no longer to be propounded to anyone), and therefore that those who had hitherto been representatives of Monotheletism were to be left unmolested on account of their previous utterances. But the Roman Bishop MARTIN I., at the Roman Synod of 649 (the first **Lateran Synod**, *i.e.* which was held in the church built by Constantine in the neighbourhood of the former Lateran Palace), with the co-operation especially of Maximus, condemned the Monothelete doctrine and the two imperial decrees; and the imperial Exarch Olympius, who afterwards came under suspicion of insurrectionary tendency, did nothing against the Roman bishop. It was only his successor (Calliopas) who gained possession of Martin by artifice (653), who was brought by ship to

Constantinople, severely treated, condemned as an insurrectionary and banished to the Crimea, where he succumbed to want and sickness among the barbarians. The grey-haired Maximus, whom on account of his theological authority people would have been pleased to see give way, was long kept a prisoner, exiled, again imprisoned, and finally deprived of his tongue and his right hand, and exiled to the Lazi, where he soon succumbed to misery. CONSTANTINE the Bearded (Pogonatus) was the first to join in negotiations with Rome, which finally led to the result that the Roman Bishop AGATHO, after having brought about synodal declarations in the West in favour of Dyotheletism, caused commissioners to proceed to a council at Constantinople, which sat from the autumn of 680 till towards the autumn of 681, and gained Œcumenical authority. The doctrine of **the two wills in Christ** was here sanctioned ; the two natures have also two wills, the relationship of which is defined by the same formula as at Chalcedon (i. 421), that of the two natures. The human will is entirely subordinated to the divine and almighty will. The **unity** is to be guarded by the unity of the hypostasis of the divine Ego. The Monothelete view is condemned and thereby also the Roman Bishop HONORIUS is expressly branded by an Œcumenical Council as a heretic. This fact has to this day caused much distress to the Roman theory, and has had to submit to many artificial attempts to explain it away.

The unprincipled and servile clergy accommodated themselves to the attempt of the Emperor PHILIPPICUS BARDANES (711-713) to bring the Monothelete doctrine again into supremacy, to face about again equally quickly, when Anastasius II. again restored the definitions of the Sixth Œcumenical Council.

A **Monothelete party** did however maintain itself. Its spiritual centre was the cloister of S. MARON on the Orontes (between Hama and Emesa). The **Maronites** chose a patriarch of their own and in the Lebanon mountains preserved their independence from the Greeks, and afterwards under Saracen rule. In the time of the Crusades these Maronites came into various relations with Rome and united themselves to the Church without giving up all their peculiarities. Recent Maronites educated in Rome exerted themselves to show that they had always been orthodox. For more exact details *vid.* RE. 9, 346.

CHAPTER THIRD.

The Second Trullan Council.

Sources : BEVEREGII *Pandectæ canonum s. synodicon*, Oxon. 1762, I. 151.—J. S. ASSEMANI *Bibl. iuris orientalis*. Rome 1766, V. 55.—HEFELE, *Conciliengeschichte* IV. 328.

THE Sixth (Œcumenical Council (680–81), at which the doctrine represented by Bishop Agatho of Rome had remained victorious, is also designated the first **Trullan Council** from the vaulted hall (τροῦλλος = ὠάτον) in the Imperial Palace, in which it was held.¹ Accordingly the council held in the same place under Emperor Justinian II. in 692 is called the Second Trullan Council. It confirmed the dogmatic decisions of the first and gave further a series of ecclesiastical definitions, in which the peculiarities of the Greek Church in contrast to Roman usage are recognisable. It thus forms a further step on the path of gradual alienation between Roman and Greek ecclesiastical institutions. As it was intended to supplement on the side of ecclesiastical legislation the two last General Councils, which had been entirely occupied with the decision of dogmatic questions, it was also designated the **Quinisextum**; its decisions are held in the Greek Church also as canons of the Sixth Œcumenical Council. Here (1) the creed-foundation of the six Œcumenical Synods is recognised, with express condemnation of the Roman Bishop Honorius, and special weight is laid on the subscription by the Emperor of the decree of faith of the Sixth. (2) The **sources of ecclesiastical law** to be recognised are then enumerated, viz. regulations of Councils and the so-called canonical epistles of older Church teachers; all which are unnamed are to be excluded. But many Western Synods of more general esteem are passed over and no epistle of a Roman bishop is named. Eighty-five canons are enumerated as Apostolic, while the West only regards fifty as valid. (3) The **rank of the patriarchs** is maintained according to the earlier definitions. Those, who by the invasion of the Arabs have been driven from their sees, still retain their rank and the right of ordin-

¹ *Vid.* Stephani Diaconi vita, Mgr. 100, 1144 d. and E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzant. period*, 1888.

ation. This concerned the **orthodox** Greek patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem ; they were titular patriarchs.

However in Egypt and Antioch in the sixth century we still find them tolerated by the Arabs. Their opposition to the iconoclastic Emperors, and consequently their enmity to the Empire, seems to have been favourable to them in the eyes of the Arabs, just as in the seventh century the Nestorian and Monophysite chiefs seem to have been tolerated by the latter.

(4) As regards the **marriage of priests**, the milder practice of the Greek Church becomes settled, in express opposition to the Roman custom. The second marriage of clerics is **forbidden**, as is the marriage of bishops with widows and those to whom some stain attaches (outcasts, *hetairæ*, serfs), for the higher clergy from sub-deacon upwards, entry upon marriage after ordination and, for the bishops, the continuation of marriage intercourse after consecration. —The wife may then pass into the position of a deaconess (cf. i. 324). This is the first **ecclesiastical prohibition** of the marriage of bishops, which however had already been rejected by Justinian in a civil law. But in opposition to Rome, **presbyters and deacons** are not bound to abstinence, in fact the dissolution of such marriages is forbidden. (5) Likewise contrary to Roman custom, fasting on Saturday, even in Lent, is forbidden.—As to other important regulations on the habits of the clergy and on matters of the cultus, see further below, chap. v.

The representatives of the Roman Bishop (Sergius I.) at the Council had signed under the pressure of the Emperor, but Sergius refused his acceptance and the opportunity of subscribing which was offered him in the second place (immediately after the Emperor). The revolt of the garrison of Ravenna and the fall of the Emperor, which followed shortly thereafter, prevented forcible measures against Rome, which in subsequent times never recognised this Council.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

The Image-Controversies.

Sources: THEOPHANES, ANASTASIUS Bibl. and for the later time the continuator of Theophanes; the CHRONOGRAPHICA NARRATIO eorum quæ tempore Leonis contigerunt (at the end of Theophanes in the Bonn edition) and SCRIPTOR INCERTUS de Leone at the end of Leo grammaticus (ed. Bekker, 1842). The Acts in Mansi XII.-XIV. The biographies of the Abbot Stephanus (in Montfaucon, *Auctarium græc. patr.* 1688), of ANDREAS Cretensis (A.S. Boll. Oct. VIII., 124), of the Patriarch NICEPHORUS by Ignatius, and of THEOPHANES by Theodorus Studita (Ibid. Mart. II.), and of THEODORUS STUDIA (in Sirmond, Opp. V. 32). The memorial of the Oriental Patriarch to Emperor Theophilus in Combesius, *Manipulus originum Constant.* 110. JOHN of Damascus, *De imaginibus* (Opp. ed. Le Quien, I. 307. Mgr. 94, 1227 sqq.). THEODORUS STUDITA (Mgr. 99, 327 sqq.) and the *Antirrhetica* of NICEPHORUS in PITRA *Spicil. Sol.* I. 302.

Literature: *Imperialia decreta de cultu imaginum in utroque imperio promulgata, coll. et ill. a* M. H. GOLDASTO, Francofurti 1608. J. DALLÆUS, *De imaginibus*, Lugd. Bat. 1642. Frid. SPANHEMI *Historia imaginum*, Lugd. Bat. 1688 (Against Lud. Maimbourg's *Histoire de l'hérésie*, etc.). WALCH, *Ketzerhistoria*, X. XI. F. Chr. SCHLOSSER, *Geschichte der bilderstürmenden Kaiser*, 1812. J. Marx (Cath.) *Der Bilderstreit der byzantinischen Kaiser* 1839. HEFELE, III. IV.

THE images of Christ and the saints in the churches and elsewhere had long become for popular piety an object of great and superstitious veneration (*vid.* i. 501); the whole tendency towards the sensuous presentation of the Divine in the cultus laid itself open to this. People deceived themselves with miraculous legends of every sort, knew of *εἰκόνες ἀχειροποιητοί*, of bleeding images, of healings of the sick and conversions by their means. As a matter of fact, there thus arose in the naïve popular conception, specially furthered by the monks, a new heathenism, or rather the old heathenism showed itself here, as in the worship of the saints in general, only under a Christian transformation. Images were invited to be sponsors, colours were scratched from the images to be mixed with the wine of the Supper and the like. Theological theory began to justify a **veneration** of images, of course to be distinguished from the **adoration** which was due to God alone. The reproach, "this generation deifies images," found a lively echo in the rude but powerful ruler,

LEO THE ISAURIAN (716-741), who having come to the front from a humble origin by a military career, raised the Greek Empire from the deepest degradation, and by a brilliant victory put a check upon the inroads¹ of the Arabs, under the Ommeyyads Valid I. and Soliman I. (who in 707 had besieged Constantinople nearly a year). He had already in 723 desired to convert Jews and Montanists by force. He now attacked with equal severity the superstition of image-worship, not indeed uninfluenced by the Mohammedan opposition to the Christian idolatry of images. The Caliph Yazid II. had taken measures against the images in the Christian provinces which he ruled. Individual bishops also, such as the Metropolitan Theodosius of Ephesus (the son of the former Emperor Apsimar), who was one of the secret counsellors of Leo, were influenced by this circumstance. Leo's prohibition of prostration before images (726) and the measures taken against the practice, called forth great excitement, which was made use of by Cosmas in the Cyclades to raise revolt against the Emperor. After the quelling of the revolt the Emperor gave command in 730 for the removal of all movable images out of the churches: the immovable (frescoes) were to be white-washed over. The popular risings which were thereby called forth were repressed with a severe hand, the opposing Patriarch GERMANUS of Constantinople, had to retire. The Roman Bishop GREGORY II. (the same who consecrated Boniface Bishop of Germany), protected by the oppressed condition of the Greek rule in Italy, in a very lofty and abrupt tone declared war against the Emperor, and his successor Gregory III. threatened (Synod of Rome in 732) all iconoclasts with the ban. The Emperor revenged himself by confiscating the revenues of the Pope from Lower Italy and by detaching the ecclesiastical province of Illyria from Rome. On the other hand, the Lombards knew how to make use of the ill-feeling for the Emperor to their own advantage. The Oriental churches under Arab supremacy abolished their ecclesiastical communion with Constantinople.

Among the theological representatives of the worship of images, JOHN of Damascus, the famous dogmatist, stands out prominently (*vid.* chap. vi.). He finally lived in the monastery of S. Saba, near Jerusalem. While the enemies of images saw heathen idolatry in the worship of them and appealed to the Old Testament prohibition, John and other friends of images declared that they were far from the delusion of a presentation of the invisible, infinite God in an image, against which that prohibition was directed.

¹ K. SCHENK, *Leon III.*, Halle 1880.

But, it was said, the fact of the Incarnation, in which the invisible became visible, justified His representation and veneration in an image, otherwise—a most significant argument!—veneration must be denied to the wood of the Cross, the book of the Gospels, the holy table, and even to the body and blood of Christ. John of Damascus accuses the iconoclasts of contempt for matter which God created. The whole nature of Greek piety impelled men, when images had once been made use of, to give to them reverent respect and therewith a certain religious veneration. But this very fact compelled the enemies of images to advance beyond the rejection of the adoration of images to the demand for their entire abolition. Between images of Christ, however, and those of Mary and other saints, since the worship of saints was already firmly rooted, no essential distinction was made. If the saints have a claim to veneration, then they have a right also to be sensuously represented for the purpose of such veneration, to man who requires some sensuous mediation.

After Leo's death, his like-minded son CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS was opposed (741-743) by his brother-in-law Artabastus, who was supported by the friends of images, and ANASTASIUS, who had been raised to the patriarchate of Constantinople in place of Germanus, was ready forthwith to face about along with him. But in the end Constantine remained victor, and at the Synod of **Constantinople** in 754, led by Theodosius of Ephesus, which was attended by no patriarch, yet was meant to be regarded as œcumenical, he caused the confirmation of the abolition of images as a suppression of a new creature-worship and idolatry, contrary to the Scriptures and the teaching of the fathers. The making of an image of Christ was either to be rejected as Monophysitism, in so far as it was a portrayal of the Godhead mingled with humanity, or as Nestorianism, in so far as it ventured to represent the humanity by itself. The true image of Christ was the Lord's Supper. The preparation also of religious images, and their private use and concealment were visited with spiritual penalties; on the other hand, the Synod expressly emphasized the veneration of the Virgin and the saints. The ban was pronounced against the worshippers of images, in particular against the friend of the Saracens and Bible-distorter MANSUR, *i.e.* John of Damascus under his Saracen name.

STEPHEN II. of Rome protested, as did also the Patriarch of the Orient, whom the Emperor could not reach; the bishops of the Greek Empire submitted, and the secular officials ruthlessly destroyed the images; even manuscripts with pictures were not spared.

But a great part of the people complained, and the monks especially clung tenaciously to the images. It was against the latter, who vied in fanatical excitement against the Emperor, that the persecution was chiefly directed. Monasteries were abolished, monks were forced into secular life, and were also maltreated and given over to the insults of the mob. The Emperor, to whom the result of his vigorous soldierly government was beneficial, actually seemed to have reached his aim. His successor LEO IV. CHAZARUS (775-780) also maintained the prohibition of images. But his wife IRENE secretly favoured the friends of images, and the monks again ventured out from their hiding places. After the death of Leo, her government as guardian for her son Constantine VI. (Porphyrogenitus) afforded them universal toleration. The monasteries again flourished; the secretary TARASIVS, who had been raised to the patriarchate of Constantinople, entered into alliance with Rome (Hadrian I.) and brought about a new council, which met at Constantinople in 786, but on account of the threatening attitude of the Imperial Body-Guard, had again to be suspended, and only after the latter had been disarmed, was really opened at Nicæa, in September, 787. In the assembly of three hundred and fifty bishops, emissaries of the Bishop of Rome also took part, and also some Oriental monks, who were regarded as representatives of the Oriental patriarchs. At this **Second Nicene Council** the Synod of 754 was repudiated as heretical and blasphemous, the restoration of images in churches, on sacred robes and vessels, in houses and on the streets, was commanded, and religious veneration (*ἀσπασμός* and *τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις*), including the burning of incense and candles before them, was assigned to them. From this is distinguished the adoration proper (*λατρεία*), which is due to God alone. The ambitious Empress Irene subsequently sought to keep her son from power, and after this attempt had been shattered by the opposition of the army, she caused him to be blinded in 797, but thereby brought about her own fall (802), without however thereby strongly affecting image-worship.

LEO V. the ARMENIAN (813-820), raised to the throne by a military insurrection, was the first to tread again in the footsteps of the two Isaurians, leaning on the support of the spirit of the army, which attributed the misfortunes of the Empire to the worship of images. In place of the Patriarch NICEPHORUS he set THEODOTUS CASSITERA, a brother-in-law of Constantine Copronymus, who had first to be ordained priest, and abolished the decisions of the Second Synod of Nicæa, but met with very tenacious opposition

the soul of which was the Abbot of the Monastery of Studion, at Constantinople, THEODORUS (STUDITA), who also still held together the banished friends of images by correspondence, allied himself with the Bishop of Rome and also with the Oriental patriarchs, and wrought by means of controversial writings, in which along with image-worship he also defended the indefeasibility of ecclesiastical laws against the arbitrary attacks of the Emperor. A more moderate position was taken up by the Emperor MICHAEL BALBUS, who being threatened with death by Leo, had overthrown him. In his letter to Lewis the Pious (Mansi, XIV. 47), on account of the gross superstition which was pursued by means of the images, he declares himself in favour of the abolition of the lower-hanging images, in order that they might not be adored by the uneducated and the weak; but on the other hand would have the others retained, *ut pictura pro scriptura haberetur*, i.e., that they may be used for looking at as a means of instruction. On the other hand, his son THEOPHILUS renewed the harsh measures towards the images and their friends, especially the monks, of whom many were makers of religious images. He caused his wife THEODORA to swear that she would maintain the prohibition against images after his death. All the same she shortly, at a synod at **Constantinople** (*Σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα* 842), caused the decisions of the Second Nicene Council to be restored, and in celebration of it she caused the Feast of Orthodoxy to be celebrated. From that time onwards the enemies of images more and more disappeared. The popular, sensuously superstitious tendency of piety, to which warmth of sentiment, but also an actually idolatrous trait, is peculiar, retains the victory over that opposition whose justified protest against the submerging of the sacred in the sensuous, at the same time appeals to **Scripture** against ecclesiastical **tradition**, and even exhibits in the background a certain general, although it is true not an openly admitted, aversion from the service of the Virgin and the saints. The dry rationalism of the iconoclasts was unable to appreciate the deeper moment, the religious æsthetical justification of the image, and the violent procedure of the state-church at once made the defence of the images a contest for the **independence of the Church**, a church which was indeed hierarchical and sinking into crude superstition.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

Circumstances of the Church.

THE heated ecclesiastical controversies, which were first thoroughly poisoned by the interference of the secular power and the spirit of Byzantinism, frequently present the repulsive spectacle of blind, passionate party-spirit closely allied with venality and want of principle, and in this respect the clergy as a whole occupies a position of little dignity. In addition, the great majority of the bishops were not even eminent in independent culture, and the Church in general prevailingly lives upon the past, and even for its philosophy lives upon the sayings of the fathers. The actual state of affairs but little corresponds to the claim for ecclesiastical election of bishops, independently of princes (II. Nic. Can. 3). The same council sought to afford protection against the **avarice** of the bishops, by forbidding the bishops to seize spiritual posts and appoint to them for money (simony). It was also necessary to issue precepts against the squandering of **church property**, and in connection therewith to inculcate the appointment of special *οἰκονομοί* to watch over church property. For the **education** of the bishops acquaintance with the psalter and the study of Scripture and the writings of the fathers is demanded. The duty of instructing the clergy and people is inculcated, in which, however, preference is to be given to the exposition of the fathers rather than to the composition of original orations (Quinis. Can. 19). Between the bishops and the lower clergy a wide separation arose in regard to social estimation. The thronging of the clergy to the capital, where they seek employment and interest from men of rank, has to be guarded against. In general, divine service is only to be held and baptism administered in the chapels of men of rank with the approval of the bishop (Quinis. Can. 31). Clerics sought employment in the houses of the great as men of business and stewards (*μειζότεροι, majores domus*), in opposition to which the Second Nicene Council (Can. 10) declares: such persons ought rather in accordance with their spiritual calling to instruct children and servants. Steps had also to be taken against **plurality** of benefices. The priest is to

content himself with one post, and if the revenues are insufficient, he is to seek earnings of other sorts besides.¹ It was only in necessitous circumstances that the combination of several spiritual offices was to be overlooked. The Second Trullan Council found occasion to issue numerous precepts as to the habits of the clergy: no cleric is to keep a wine shop, lend money on interest, have to do with the Jews—as in general no Christian is to eat of the Paschal cakes of the Jews, have intimate intercourse with them, take medicine from them, or bathe with them. No cleric or monk might take part in the passionately beloved horse-races, or be a spectator of the theatre, or remain at marriages when the games began.

The great preponderance of ecclesiastical interest turns on the **cultus**. In this period the mass of S. Chrysostom essentially took its final form with all its ceremonial acts and dramatising performances (*vid.* Swainson, I. 575). So likewise the Greek Church shows itself very fertile in the equipment of divine worship with church **hymns and odes**. The cultus suffers from great superfluity in this respect. John of Damascus, Andrew of Crete, Cosmas of Jerusalem, Theophanes of Nicæa and others are eminent as authors of such church poetry. *Vid.* i. 528 sqq. and of the literature there referred to, especially JACOBI.

The Byzantinism of the time gives the Emperor in the sphere of the cultus also a preference over all other laymen; he only, when he desires to make an offering, may enter within the barriers of the holy of holies (Quinisextum, Can. 69). The liturgy prescribes both the bearing of the clergy down to the smallest detail, and also defines the manner in which the laity shall hold their hands at the reception of the communion (Quinis. Can. 101). The *Missa præsanctificationum* (*vid.* i. 528) is ordained (Quinis. 52) as a regulation for the Easter feast-time with exception of the Saturdays and Sundays (and the Feast of the Annunciation to Mary). To the importance which the Church ascribed to images, Canon 82 of the Quinisextum also bears witness: "In the paintings of sacred figures there is found the Lamb, to which the finger of the fore-runner pointed as the type of the true Lamb, Christ our God. Let us willingly receive the types and shadows, which are handed down as symbols of the Church, but yet let us prefer grace and truth itself to them. The perfect ought therefore also to be presented to the eyes in the paintings. Instead of the old lamb, henceforward the true Lamb, which bears our sins, Christ in human form, ought to be set up

¹ Cf. on this point, i. 328 sq.

(ἀναστηλοῦσθαι), so that thereby we may recognise the greatness of the humiliation of the divine Logos, and be led to the remembrance of His walk in the flesh, His suffering and His redeeming death." Here therefore the figure of the Crucified, the **Crucifix**, which had not as yet long made its appearance, is recognised in place of the merely symbolical cross, as described by Anastasius Sinaita in the *ὁδηγός*. Like Anastasius, so also this canon of the Second Trullan Council, is guided by a certain inclination to emphasize the reality of the suffering human form¹ against Monophysite exaggerations.² With the tenacious fight for the images there was allied a renewed zeal for relics, which seem to have been pretty lukewarmly regarded by the iconoclasts. The Second Nicene Council (Can. 7) ordains, that in all temples which have been consecrated without the introduction of relics, such are now to be deposited with the usual prayers, but in the future no bishop may consecrate a church without relics, on pain of deposition. The bringing back to Jerusalem by Heraclius of the wood of the cross which had been carried off by the Persians, gave origin to a special ecclesiastical feast, that of the Elevation of the Cross. The whole mystical exaggeration of the Greeks found rest in the adoration of the saints, especially in that of the Holy Virgin; it is expressed in the **hymns** of Bishop Cosmas of Majuma, the adoptive brother of John of Damascus, in the homilies of the latter, and in many other instances. Corresponding to this is the increasing growth of legends about their lives, which now frequently culminate in their ascension to heaven.

The spirit of Greek piety certainly was strongest and comparatively purest in the **monasteries**, although here also all sorts of abuses had to be met, and alongside of this, in its way ideal, monasticism, the ordinary monasticism of handicrafts without doubt preponderated. On the whole the bishops, who indeed mostly proceeded from monasteries themselves, stood on friendly relationship with them. Certainly the monasteries, as also individual churches, sought to withdraw themselves from the jurisdiction of their diocesan bishop and place themselves immediately under the patriarch. But the Patriarch Germanus ordained that only those churches, monasteries, and oratories of his patriarchate should stand

¹ In consequence of the Greek development of doctrine the addition to the Trishagion carried out by Justinian: *ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς* is now set aside by the Second Trullan Council. Can. 81.

² Cf. HEFELE, *Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte*, II. 265. DOBBERT, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Crucifix* in the *Jhrbch. d. kgl. preus. Kunstsamm.* Berlin 1881, I. ENGELHARDT in ZWL. 1880, p. 188 sqq.

immediately under him, in which at the time of their foundation the cross of the patriarchate was erected, the so-called *σταυροπήγιον πατριαρχικόν*, a cross of wood, on which the date was marked, buried behind the altar. These are the patriarchal churches and monasteries, in which the diocesan bishop did not exercise the smallest power, and where the liturgy only made mention of the patriarch. Yet the bishop was to retain his rights to the landed properties, houses and oratories which indeed belonged to patriarchal monasteries but in which the cross had not been set up. Metropolitans also sought at times by the erection of their cross in the monasteries to get them under their power. Ecclesiastical legislation also sought to secure the monasteries against encroachment upon their property by the appointment of *οἰκονομοί* of their own and other ecclesiastical regulations, so likewise to make good the severe injury done to monasteries by the iconoclasts. The bishops appoint the presidents of the monasteries and also give them, in case of their holding ecclesiastical ordination, certain clerical functions, *e.g.*, the ordination of lectors. Double monasteries of monks and nuns were to continue according to the rule of S. Basil, only monks and nuns were not to inhabit one building, but new double monasteries were not to be erected. When whole families desired to renounce the world, the men had to enter monasteries for men, the women monasteries for women. In general all contact of the sexes is scouted. Wandering monks or hermits, who wander about the cities, with long hair, and consort with secular persons and women, were to be opposed, but similarly also monks who desert their monasteries and without sufficient means desire to erect small oratories of their own.

In the view of THEODORUS STUDITA the ecclesiastical institution of strictly regulated monasticism belongs as much to the mysteries of the Church (supernatural means of salvation), as baptism, the Lord's Supper, unction, the consecration of priests, and the rites of burial; for according to the example of the AREOPAGITE these are the six mysteries of the Church; he who doubts one of them, brings the others also into doubt (*Th. Stud. Ep.* 165, p. 1523 in *Mgr.* 99). Here all stress is laid on strict adherence to the rule, but also on the humility of self-denying love and the renunciation of all private property. *Id.* The Testament of Theodorus (*Mgr.* 99, 1814; ed. Sirmond. p. 63), which also contains a very unvarnished expression of the fact that this ascetic piety necessarily hovers between trust in the merit of works and uncertainty as to one's own state of salvation.

*CHAPTER SIXTH.***Eminent Representatives of the Greek Church in Monasticism and Theology.**

IN spite of the serious defectiveness of the Greek Church, this period is not lacking in the emergence of men of strong character, in whom the spirit of ecclesiastical piety, one-sidedly ascetic and averse from the practical morality of the world as it now is, brings forth fruits worthy of recognition. In monasticism we find relatively most of the honest and pious devotion to the faith and the good of the Church and to the ideal of monastic perfection, which is really honestly in earnest about the matter. With ascetic strictness there is here combined the love of the contemplative life, of learning and of theological studies; hence the most important representatives of theology proceed from among the monks. From the sixth century there still project into this period those genuine representatives of Greek monastic mysticism, *Johannes MOSCHUS* († 619) and *Johannes CLIMACUS* († 606). In contact with both was *SOPHRONIUS* (p. 8), who took part in the *Monothelite* controversy. He in turn was called master, father, and teacher by the man who is far the most important and fertile among the theologians of the seventh century, *MAXIMUS* (Confessor), born about 580 of a family of rank, for a long time private secretary to the Emperor *Heraclius*. About 630 he entered as "a lover of divine philosophy" into the monastery of *Chrysopolis* near *Constantinople*, of which he soon became abbot. Subsequently we find him in *North Africa* in close relationship with the *Byzantine Procurator*, *Gregorius*, where he begins to interfere in the *Monothelite* controversy in the manner described above. The theology of *Maximus*, resting on the study of the older fathers, but especially of *Gregory Nazianzen* and *Dionysius Areopagita*, guides *Christian Neo-Platonism* of the character of the *Areopagite* into ecclesiastical paths. With the mystico-speculative elements there is combined the formal *Aristotelianism* of the definition of conceptions, such as had already been naturalized in the pursuit of polemical theology since *Leontius of Byzantium* and *John Philoponus*.

Alongside of the *Scholia in opp. S. Dion Areop.*, the treatise *De variis difficultibus locis sanct. patr. Dion. et Gregorii* and the *ἄπορα εἰς Γρηγόριον* (the two last according to the complete text of the Codex Gudianus in OEHLER, *Anecdota Græca*, I. Halle 1857), there stand numerous treatises in favour of the Christology of the Church and the doctrine of two wills (among them the *Disputatio cum Pyrrho* above mentioned). His exegetical writings treat individual passages of Scripture as problems of dogmatical and mystical speculation. Such are the *Quæstiones ad Thalassium*, which, in regard to form, somewhat recall Theodoret's *Quæstiones in Octateuchum*, but in regard to spirit recall Cyril of Alexandria's *Glaphyra*. The spirit of Greek contemplative and ascetic monasticism on its practical side is represented by his λόγος ἀσκητικός with an appendix forming κεφάλαια ἀγάπης, four centuries of sentences of an ethical, but partly also of a dogmatical and mystical purport, as regards style of writing and feeling, somewhat to be compared with the 400 *sententiæ de sincera charitate, vitæ continentia et mentis regimine* of his contemporary Thalassius (Mgr. 91, 1423 sq.). But those of Maximus hang more closely together and are better wrought out, those of Thalassius are shorter, more sententious. and among much that is trivial contain many a pithy word. Other collections of sentences by Maximus are more of a dogmatic character. Characteristic of the growing spirit of collecting are compilations of mere excerpts, partly from Scripture, partly also from Christian and Pagan authors (κεφάλαια θεολογικά) a favourite kind of literature (Maximi opp. in Mgr. 91). Almost a contemporary of his but somewhat younger, is ANASTASIUS SINAÏTA, the author of an unimportant treatise against the Monophysites (Ὁδηγός I. 432), as well as of allegorico-mystical treatment of the history of Creation, and the *Quæstiones et responsiones* collected from older writings. Opp. Mgr. 89. cf. KUMPFMUELLER, *De Anast. Sinaita*, Würzb. 1865 and Dict. of Christ. Biog. by Smith and Wace, I. 109.

The ecclesiastical theology of the eighth century is most eminently represented by JOHN of DAMASCUS, in an otherwise not very productive time, when under the storms of the image-controversies, the traditional ecclesiastical science had itself to suffer along with the monasteries, the chief seats of its cultivation. John was born towards the close of the seventh or in the beginning of the eighth century. He was the son of Sergius, a (Christian) official of the Caliph Abdelmalek; he originally bore the name of his grandfather, Mansur (*i.e.* the Redeemed), a name which was contemptuously turned into Mamzer (bastard) by his opponents. John himself seems also to have been in the service of the Caliph. He is said to have owed his learned culture to a Western (Sicilian) monk, Cosmas. From his secular career he turned to the monastic and learned life in the monastery of S. Sabas near Jerusalem. From this point he combated the enemies of images by writing, but also personally on journeys which brought him as far as Constantinople, in the sense of the theological vindication of the popular cultus and at the same time of opposition to the interference of the secular ruler in ecclesiastical questions. John seems to have died before the Synod of 754 which was hostile to images.

Of his numerous writings the **Three Orations** on images relate to the controversy of the century, while the oration in defence of images addressed to Constantine Cabalinos and the controversial treatises against the Iconoclasts (both in the works of John) do not proceed from him, others are controversial treatises against Manichees, Saracens, Jacobites (Monophysite) and Nestorians, and dogmatic discussions, homilies and panegyrics. The chief work, however, is the **Source of Knowledge** (*πηγή γνώσεως*), to a certain extent the gathering together of the outcome of patristic theology, and in its arrangement significant for the development which the latter had followed. Book I., philosophico-dialectical, gives the logical definitions which were to pass into the service of dogmatics; heathen wisdom, which is to serve truth as female slaves a king. Aristotle, Porphyry and Ammonius are here the guides which have already long become serviceable to the Church. Book II. contains a history of heresy on the basis of the information supplied by the older Greek heresiologists. Book III. (*ἔκδοσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως*), a presentation of the Church's doctrine of belief, according to the testimony of the most eminent fathers, specially the Greeks, but also of one of the Latins, Leo the Great, especially on account of his participation in the Christological conflicts. In the arrangement of the matter the example of Theodoret (*Hæret. fabul. comp.*, Bk. v.) may be recognised. The **Parallela** are excerpts from the fathers, not unimportant as sources for the earlier patristics. If the so-called Commentary on the Pauline Epistles (essentially an extract from Chrysostom, occasionally making use of Theodoret and Cyril) owes its origin to John of Damascus, he exhibits the early beginning of this merely excerpting method. Opp. ed. Le Quien, Paris 1712, 2 vols.; Mgr. 94-96. Cf. J. LANGEN, *Johann von Damascus*, Gotha 1879.

One of the most eminent **monastic figures** at the close of this period, a man of wide-reaching, so to speak prophetic activity, is THEODORUS STUDITA, born in 759 at Constantinople of noble parents. Plato, abbot of the monastery of Saccodion, in 781 persuaded him with his whole family (his parents, brothers and sisters) to devote himself to the monastic life, to which Theodore gave himself up with the utmost stringency, renunciation and self-chastening. He was ordained priest by the Patriarch Tarasius, and next, on Plato's instigation, made the former's successor. On account of entrance into a second marriage (after the dissolution of the first), he declared the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus (the son of Irene) to be excluded from the Christian community; and so powerful was his word, that Constantine sought in every way to propitiate him. It was only when this had failed, that he caused him, with eleven companions, to be scourged and imprisoned in Thessalonica, without however being able to break down the opposition of his party. After the blinding and putting to death of Constantine by his mother Irene (in 797), the latter overwhelmed him with expressions of honour and gave over to him the important monastery of Studion in Constantinople, which through him became greatly renowned.

This tenacious and tireless man, endowed with the faculty of a ruler, was able to keep in order the host of monks, which finally amounted to towards 1,000. After the fall of Irene (802), he fell into conflict with the Emperor Nicephorus (on account of the marriage of Constantine, which Nicephorus caused to be legitimized by a Synod), and was imprisoned along with his monks (809-811). So likewise he was persecuted by the friend of images, Leo the Armenian (814), when he would not allow himself to be put to silence. Michael Balbus, indeed, restored him (821), but Theodore fell under suspicion of revolt and took flight to the island of S. Trypho, where he died in 862.

Among his writings, alongside of the controversial writings and letters relating to the image-controversy, as well as those of a practical ascetic character, his **Greater and Lesser Catechisms** are worthy of notice, collections of short sermons, which at that time were publicly read in the Greek Church. Cf. Mgr. 99. 505 sqq.

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

The Paulicians.

Sources: GEORGII MONACHI dicti HAMARTOLI *Chronicon* ed. E. de Muralto Petrop. 1859, IV. c. 238. The same writer's un preserved treatise on the Paulicians forms the foundation for PETRUS SICULUS (about 870), *Hist. Manich. qui dicuntur Paulic.* Gr. et Lat. ed. Roderus, Ingolst. 1604, Giese-ler, Gött. 1846. Mgr. 104. PHOTIUS, *περὶ τῆς Μανιχαίων ἀναβλαστ.* ap. Gall. XIII. 603. JOH. OZNIENSIS Armenorum cathol. opp. ed. Aucher. Venice 1834, cf. NEUMANN *Geschichte der Armen. Lit.* p. 107. The *Formula receptionis Manich. ad Paulic.* in TOLLII *Insignia itin. Ital.* Holm. 1696, 4. L. GIESE-ler in the StKr. 1829. DOELLINGER, *Beiträge zur Sectengeschichte des M.A. I.*, sqq.

IN connection with the earlier phenomena of Oriental religious syncretism there grew up for the Byzantine Church of the Empire a hostile party, which caused it trouble for centuries, in the so-called **Paulicians**, who called themselves **Christians**, but whom the members of the Byzantine Church called **Romans**. Their contemporaries like to call them **Manichees**, *i.e.* dualistic heretics, and trace back their doctrine to a Manichee woman CALLINICE and her sons PAUL and JOHN, but of this the Paulicians will not hear: "Manes, Paul, and John and many others they confidently condemn, while they hold Constantine (their founder) and those who follow him in high esteem as apostles of Christ" (Georgius Hamartolus). Influences of Parseeism certainly long made themselves noticeable on Armenian soil mixed up with Christian phenomena (the sect called by the Armenian Christians, *Children of the Sun*, *i.e.* Sun-worshippers). But anything specific of this sort comes but little to the front among the Paulicians; much more obvious is an attachment to **Marcionite** doctrine, which long maintained itself in that Eastern neighbourhood. To such a Marcionite community in **Mananalis** near Samosata on the Upper Euphrates, probably belonged CONSTANTINE, who made his appearance as a religious reformer about 660 in Kibossa (near the town of Colonia in Armenia Prima). It was acquaintance with the Scriptures of the New Testament which called forth great agitation in him and through him among his adherents; pure apos-

tolic and indeed **Pauline** Christianity was to be opposed to the falsified Christianity of the Church. As the disciple of Paul he called himself *Sylvanus*, and his community *Macedonia*. For twenty-seven years he worked very energetically for the diffusion of his sect, till the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus caused its chiefs and obstinate adherents to be punished with death. But SYMEON, the Byzantine officer of state whose duty it was to carry out these measures, received such impressions in doing so, that after eight years he returned to the remnant of the community at Kibossa and now himself presided over it as leader (under the name of Titus), till, accused before the Bishop of Colonia, he was brought to the stake with many of his companions by an Imperial Commission (under Justinian II. about 690). A certain Paul now became their chief, whose son GENESIUS¹ was brought to Constantinople for examination under Leo the Isaurian. In the trial before the Patriarch he is said to have made peace by accommodating himself to orthodox principles.

The conjecture is obvious that sympathy with the hostility to images, with which also the Paulicians were accustomed to begin their polemic against the Greek Church, had favourably influenced the ruling party in Constantinople towards him. Divisions in the community were not wanting. Genesius was opposed by his younger brother THEODORE who appealed to the Spirit, which is not bound to the legitimate succession; in subsequent times Josephus (= Epaphroditus) was opposed by a certain Zacharias, who was designated a mercenary by a part of the Paulicians. The meanwhile greatly increased community, which had also spread itself to part of Asia Minor (Phanorœa in Helenopontus), after BAANES, who was reproached with antinomian principles (hence *ῥυπαρός*), received in SERGIUS (= Tychicus) about 801, a reformer who was active in the spread and confirmation of the sect in the province of Asia Minor, on the soil where S. Paul had once wrought, and won many priests, monks and nuns. As the distinctive peculiarities of the sect appear on the one hand a certain **dualism**, on the other a decidedly high estimation of the gospel and the apostolic writings as the universal possession of believers. Connected with the former is a Docetic view of the incarnation, with the latter a conscious opposition to the hierarchy of the Church of the Empire. Both with the founder (Const.) and with the reformer (Sergius) it is just the power of the victorious biblical principle which is emphasized.

¹ So in Georgius Hamartolus; in Petr. Sic. *Γεγνέσιος*, in Phot. *Γεγναίσιος*. The last two forms perhaps owe their origin to the circumstance that Georg. Ham. in narrating cites thus: *γ' Γενέσιος*.

The Paulicians oppose the good God, as the heavenly Father, whom they worship, to the Demiurge, the Creator and Lord of this world. He is he who before Christ was unknown, of whom the latter says in the gospel: his voice ye have not heard, nor have ye ever seen his form. All who came before Christ were thieves and robbers. Accordingly the Old Testament is repudiated as the work of the Demiurge; the New Testament they accept like the Church, only with the exception of the Second Epistle of that Apostle who became a renegade. The Mother of God they do not recognise as such, for the Lord appeared on earth with a heavenly body. They do not receive the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, and do not partake of it, as by flesh and blood Christ merely designated His words symbolically. So likewise they repudiate the sacrament of baptism, as they hold to the idea, that the Lord is the living water. The adoration of the Cross, the instrument of the evil doers, they decidedly reject. If in relation to this point it is asserted, that in sickness they laid a heavy wooden cross on the breast of the sick-person, which, after he was cured, was unhesitatingly split up for household purposes, this is only a reflection of the fact of the involuntary power of general superstition even amid the maintenance of the intellectual conception. Finally they will have nothing to do with presbyters in the Church, in general, indeed, with any hierarchical constitution, in contrast to which their free spiritual community is held to be the true Church.

The activity of Sergius seems to have been fertile in results, especially through the use of passages of Scripture to combat a dead official ecclesiasticism. The strong *πληροφορία* of conviction, the living feeling of the Spirit working in him, made a strong impression on many laymen, and also on monks and clergy. Sergius must also have carried out a purification. Three communities are said to have been excommunicated by him (Georg. Ham.), which is probably connected with the conversion which was accomplished under the stress of persecution. After the Emperor NICEPHORUS (802-811), who came from Pisidia and had already in his youth been influenced by the Paulicians, had showed himself favourable to them,¹ the Emperor MICHAEL (Kuropalates = Rhangabe) caused many of them to be executed; the vigorous persecution under Leo the Armenian again drove many, among them Sergius, to Asia Minor which was under Saracen rule. The Paulicians in the Armenian city of Kynoschora (community of Laodicea) had in their embitterment murdered the Imperial Commission of inquiry, Bishop Thomas of Neocæsarea and the Abbot Paracondaces, and fled on that account. From the Arabs they received the little city of **Argaum** (Colossæ), assigned to them as a residence, and from this centre, in the character of a politico-religious party in a state of war with the Roman Empire, they began to make raids and drag subjects of the Empire to prison, an attitude

¹ Theophan. Chronogr. ed. De Boor p. 488, 23; 495, 2; 497, 5, where the Ἀθ'γγανοί in Phrygia and Lydia appear in close connection with them.

which was disapproved by Sergius. Laodicea (*i.e.* Argaum) and Colossæ (*i.e.* Kynoschora) are mentioned among the communities excommunicated by Sergius. After the death of Sergius no sectarian chief was able to assert himself in the exclusive position of leader. The individual teaching personages, designated *συνέκδημοι* after 2 Cor. viii 19; Acts xix. 29, desired to represent the sect in common. Besides, an opposition survived between the adherents of Baanes who had been combated by Sergius, and the Sergiotes. But the turn of political events, as a matter of fact, now led to the emergence of a **political leader**. Under the Empress THEODORA, who carried on a most bloody persecution against them, new hosts of persecuted Paulicians fled from Asia Minor to Saracen territory; among them, CARBEAS (about 814) obtained possession of the leadership, while the earlier religious party differences subsided. Carbeas (formerly adjutant to the Imperial Commander-in-Chief), whose father had been one of the Paulicians killed by the troops, placed himself at the head of 5,000 Paulicians, and his sect grew into a politico-religious community, troublesome to the Byzantine Empire, which especially from Tephrica, which was situated on the frontier, made forays and carried on guerilla warfare with the Imperial troops.

SECOND DIVISION.

The Western Church.

CHAPTER FIRST.

Christianity among the Germanic Tribes from the first beginnings till about 600 A.D.

Literature: R. PALLMANN, *Geschichte der Völkerwanderung*, 2 vols. Weimar 1863 sq. E. von WIETERSHEIM, *Gesch. der Völkerwanderung*, 4 vols. Leipzig 1859, 2nd edition by F. DAHN 1880 sqq.—F. DAHN, *Die Könige der Germanen*, 6 vols. Munich 1861 sqq. Id. *Urgeschichte d. german. u. roman. Völker*, I. 1881 (in Oncken II., II., 1 and 2); Id. *Deutsche Gesch. I. (Gesch. der Urzeit)*, Gotha 1883. RÜCKERT, *Kulturgeschichte d. deutschen Volkes in d. Z. d. Ueberg. aus d. Heidenthum in d. Christenthum*. 2 vols. Leipzig 1853.—G. KAUFMANN, *Deutsche Geschichte bis auf Karl d. G.* 2 vols. Leipzig 1880 sqq.—W. ARNOLD, *Deutsche Geschichte*. Gotha 1879 and 1881 (1. Urzeit. 2. fränk. Zeit, 1. Hälfte).

THE Church essentially completed its organization on the soil of the Roman Empire and its provinces, and therefore also with the means supplied by Græco-Roman civilization. Since the breaking in of the barbaric nations and the revolutions of the migration of the peoples, however, a foreign element had thrust itself into the domain of the Church of the Empire, which, though immediately seized by Christianity, mainly remained foreign to the Church of the Empire, and planted new ecclesiastical forms throughout its sphere. But while the Roman Empire itself was ruined over this matter in the West, the Latin Church, with the superiority of its organization and civilization, exercised a growing power and gradually assimilated the special Germano-Roman forms.

1. The Goths.

Sources: On ULFILA the Greek ecclesiastical historians Socrates, Sozomen, Philostorgius, and the narratives of the Arian Bishop AUXENTIUS of Dorostorus in G. WAITZ, *Ueber das Leben und die Lehre des Ulfila*. Hann. 1870. Cf. BESSEL, *ii. d. Leben u. d. Lehre des Ulfila u. die Bek. d. G.* Gött. 1860 and G. KAUFMANN in ZdA. 27. *History of the Goths*: JORNANDES or JORDANIS (an Alan but allied by marriage with the Gothic tribe of the Amals, † middle of the sixth century) *De origine actibusque Getarum*, ed. Mommsen in MG Auctores ant. XV. 1882: is based on the lost 12 books of

Gothic history by Cassiodorus.—PROCOPIUS, *De bello Goth.* vid. I. 295. ISIDORUS Hisp., *De regibus Got.* Ml. 83, 1057.—W. KRAFFT, *KG. der german. Völker*, I. 1 (unic.), Berlin 1854, id. in RE. 16, 140. C. A. A. SCOTT, *Ulfilas*. London 1885.

Since the middle of the third century the Goths had become menacing to the Roman Empire. Decius with the greater part of his army had fallen in conflict with them. Soon thereafter, especially under Valerian and Gallienus, they fell upon Asia Minor and came as far as Cappadocia. Aurelian was obliged to cede to them the province of Dacia beyond the Danube, and the Roman provincials withdrew across the river. Constantine obtained peace for some time. They were first made acquainted with Christianity by Christian prisoners of war, and their relations to Constantine, to whom they rendered war-service as *fœderati* of the Empire, may probably have given opportunity among them for scanty beginnings of ecclesiastical organization. At the Council of Nicæa a certain Theophilus appears as Bishop of Gotia, whose see however is probably to be sought among the Tetraxite Goths in the Crimea, who were separated from the Goths of the Danube. But the real apostle of his people is the Goth ULFILA or VULFILA, born about 311. His descent from a Christian family (Philost.) which under Valerian had been carried off by the Goths from Cappadocia is doubted.¹ Under Constantine he came to Constantinople with an embassy. Being already in possession of the office of lector, he was then consecrated a bishop by Eusebius of Nicomedia about 341. He wrought as a pastor and religious leader among the so-called Visi-Goths (Thervings) beyond the Danube, until severe persecutions against the Gothic Christians were undertaken by a petty chief of the Goths (Athanaric?), in consequence of which Ulfila and a considerable number of Christian Goths were expelled in 348 and received a place of residence in Mœsia from the Emperor Constantius. Here he wrought for thirty-three years longer as bishop, for the Trans-Danubian Goths also, among whom Christianity maintained itself in spite of persecution until his death. It was the **Arian** form of Christianity which he had received; and he was present at the Synod of the Homoians at Constantinople in 360 (i. 390). Ulfila died in 388 in Constantinople itself, whither Theodosius had summoned him for the adjustment of quarrels among the numerous Goths, but not for renewed discussions as to the faith.

The translation of the Bible by Ulfila was the foundation of

¹ *Vid.* however, what G. KAUFMANN asserts in favour of it against Bessel, l.c. p. 215 sqq.

the Christian civilization of the Goths, the foundation stone of German literature. Whether he completed the work, whether in general the translation of the Old Testament was ever completed, remains a question; but Philostorgius asserts that Ulfla had translated the whole of the Bible with the exceptions of the Books of Kings, from which he feared too much stimulus to the warlike spirit of his people. Preserved and drawn forth from long neglect are the four gospels (with great hiatuses), contained in the very ancient *Codex Argenteus*, which the Swedes in the Thirty Years War brought from Prague to Upsala; besides them there are fragments of the Epistle to the Romans (the Wolfenbüttel palimpsest) and of the Old Testament only very trifling fragments.¹

The spread of Christianity among the Trans-Danubian Goths about 370 again called forth a vigorous persecution by Athanaric, but his opponent Fritigern afforded protection to the Christians, soon thereafter himself became an Arian Christian, and was able, with the support of the Emperor Valens, to assert himself against his opponents and to favour the growth of the Christian faith. The Audians (i. 361) also carried on Christian missions among the Goths. The pressing in of the Huns, beginning from 375, first on the Ostro-Goths (Greuthungs under Hermanaric) and then of these on the Visi-Goths, drove the latter under Fritigern for the most part into Roman territory (Thrace), which promoted their Christianization. Next there came a rupture between the Goths, who thronged in in ever-increasing numbers, and the Roman state power; the Emperor Valens fell in the battle at Adrianople (378), and the Goths became masters in Mœsia and Thrace; Theodosius succeeded in concluding peace with them, and the Visi-Goths passed into the Roman service as *fœderati*, soon dangerous friends. Theodosius would willingly have also brought them to unity of faith with the Church of the Empire; but the steps taken for this purpose remained without result; the recognition of orthodoxy by imperial law which was brought about by Theodosius only formed a fetter for him. The exertions of Chrysostom, to win them for the orthodox confession, had also only trivial results. The Goths who were so powerful in Constantinople under GAINAS desired to have a church in the capital for their confession, but Chrysostom refused it, in consequence of which a catholic bishopric of the Tetraxite Goths arose in the Crimean Peninsula. But this did not lead to much. From the

¹ First collected edition by von GABELENTZ and J. LOEBE, Leipz. 1843-46. 4 vols. Handy editions by MASSMANN, STAMM and in Zacher's German. Handbibl. by E. BERNHARD, Halle 1875.

Goths the Arian form of Christianity reached the Gepidæ, Heruli, Rugi, Vandals, and Alans.

After the death of Theodosius in 395 and the division of the Empire between ARCADIVS and HONORIUS, the Visi-Goths under Alaric roused themselves to that destructive advance south of the Danube as far as the Peloponnese. Here they thoroughly cleared out the remains of paganism; they then advanced on Italy, which after Stilicho's death refused them tribute. They appeared before Rome in 408, and again, in order to break down the opposition of Honorius, in 410, when Rome surrendered and the heathen prefect Attalus, baptized by a Gothic bishop, Sigisarius, was raised to empire, but shortly allowed to fall again by Alaric. Finally, they appeared for the third time. The conquerors, who plundered and destroyed by fire the monuments of heathenism, and weakened the noble Roman families, here still the powerful supporters of heathenism, spared the sacred places of the Christians and recognised their right of asylum. When Alaric had found an early death in South Italy, his successor ATAVLF entered into the service of Honorius, in order in return for the acquisition of settled dwelling-places, to restore again the Roman dominion in Gaul and Spain in opposition to the Vandals (with the Suevi and Alans), who had thronged in since 406, and allied himself in marriage with Galla Placidia, the sister of Honorius, who had been in his hands as a hostage since the second march on Rome. The conquest of Spain which he began in the name of the Roman rule led under WALLIA to the rise of the **Visi-Gothic Kingdom of Tolosa** (419). After the new outbreak of the Huns under ATILA (434-455) the Visi-Goths co-operated in association with the Franks and the Burgundians on the side of the Romans (Aëtius) against the Huns and their dependents, the Ostro-Goths, Gepidæ, Heruli, and Rugi, for the rescue of Roman Christian civilization. The subordination to Rome which was still maintained here, was gradually extinguished, when the Visi-Gothic kingdom under EURIC reached its greatest extension in Spain.

2. The Arianism of the rest of the East-Germanic Tribes and Kingdoms and the Ostro-Gothic Kingdom in Italy.

Sources: VICTORIS VITENSIS, *Hist. persecutionis Afric.* ed. Halm (MG. Auct. ant. III. 1, 1879) and ed. M. Petschenig, 1881 (*Scr. eccl. lat.* VII.).—PAULUS DIACONUS, *De gestis Langob.* in *M. G. Scriptt. rer. Lang. et Ital. sæc. VI.* -IX.

When Stilicho had brought in the legions from Britain and the Rhine for the protection of Italy, the **Vandals** with the Suevi and Alans had burst devastating across the Rhine into Gaul (406)

and thence pressed into Spain (409). Opposed here by the Visi-Goths who were in alliance with Rome, the Asdingian Vandals, after the Silingians and the Alans had been almost extirpated in the South of Spain, passed over into North Africa under their king GAISERIC (427-477), and here, after a ten years' war, founded the **Arian Vandal Kingdom**, to which Valentinian III. had to surrender the possession of the greater part of Roman North Africa. The plundering of Sicily and Rome (455) indicates the culmination of their power.

Under Gaiseric and his successor HUNNERIC (477-484) the subject Catholic population was fearfully oppressed, and the Catholic creed ruthlessly persecuted. The cruel, but simple-mannered conquerors were soon infected by Roman immorality. Under Justinian I. the Vandal Kingdom was again won for Byzantine rule (534).

The **Suevi** who had thronged into Spain with the Vandals, and who occupied the north-west portion of the country, had here come under the influence of Roman (Catholic) Christianity, but under the preponderance of the Visi-Goths, who limited them to Galicia, they attached themselves from the time of REMISMUND, in 465, to the Arian confession.

The **Burgundians**, who were likewise related to the Goths, appear from the time of the great movement of the peoples in the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century, as auxiliaries of the Romans against the Alamanni, settled (413) on both sides of the Middle Rhine (Mayence, Worms). Here those on the left bank of the Rhine at first attached themselves to Roman Christianity; about 430 those also on the right bank, as it seems by a conversion *en masse*, being baptized after an eight days' preparation by a Gaulish bishop.¹ They next marched further south, and settled on the Rhone and in modern Savoy. While their dependence on Roman rule more and more disappeared, to cease entirely with the fall of the Western Empire, the influence of the Visi-Goths led the Burgundians also from the Catholic to the Arian creed.

The tribes who were freed from the Hunnish yoke after the death of Attila (Heruli, Rugi, **Ostro-Goths**), admitted as auxiliaries into the Roman army, now brought about the so-called fall of the Western Roman rule (about 476). ODOACER (476-493) himself took the place of the last Roman shadow-emperor, Romulus Augustulus, and called himself King of Italy; the barbarians settled down with their women and children, and to them the owners of the soil rendered the *tertiae sortes*. For the rest the constitution and the law

¹ HAUCK, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, I. 98.

remained unaffected, and tolerance was also exercised towards the Church. Then the Ostro-Goths under THEODORIC (475-526), brought in by the Emperor Zeno from Pannonia, conquered Italy and founded the **Ostro-Gothic dominion** (from 493). A form of dependence on Eastern Rome was maintained, and Theodoric, as King of Italy, was recognised under the title of Patrician.

Next, when Justinian I., after a twenty years' war (535-555), had extirpated the Ostro-Goths and made Italy again a province of the Empire, the Lombards appeared as the last in this series of East Germanic tribes, being called in to help against the Goths. They conquered the greater part of Italy, so that only Rome and Naples, the southern point of Italy and Sicily, the Venetian Islands, and the East Coast from the north mouth of the Po to Ancona, remained under the Byzantine rule, which had its seat in **Ravenna** (568). The Lombards, who no longer even in appearance recognised the superiority of the Greek Emperor, already brought with them the Arian creed.

3. The Relation of the Germanic-Arian Conquerors to the Catholic Romans.

Where the nations, like the Visi-Goths and the Burgundians, had originally made their entrance as allies, the settlement took place in the form of permanent quartering and a formal understanding as to the sharing of the land, soil, etc. As here the Roman civil administration continued to exist in important points, so also the existing Catholic ecclesiastical system of the Roman populace was spared; the victors merely introduced their own Arian clergy and ecclesiastical system alongside of the other. Theodoric in particular left full freedom to the Catholic ecclesiastical system. The Bishop of Rome occupied a position of the highest esteem and influence. The Ostro-Gothic clergy stood lower than the Roman in culture and consideration; educated Catholic Romans, like Cassiodorius (*vid. i.* 373, 470) and others, already occupied high offices at Court and of State under Odoacer and afterwards under Theodoric. The schism which occurred just at this time between the Roman and the Greek Church (*i.* 349, 424) proved very favourable to the Roman Catholics. It was only after the adjustment of this schism in 518 that they began to be suspected of conspiring with Byzantium. Pope John was obliged to suffer imprisonment, and the Roman Senators Symmachus, Albinus and Boëtius fell victims.

It was otherwise where **conquest** had taken place and only the right of the stronger prevailed. The **Vandals** in North Africa took what they required without a regulated division of the land, drove

off or murdered the proprietors and degraded the other provincials to bondmen. It was only after complete conquest that more forbearance came in, and the subjected populace, which formed the greater mass, gained a growing influence by its language and civilization. Here the Catholic Church was also severely persecuted under Gaiseric and Hunneric.¹ It was only under Hilderic that the already weakened kingdom sought alliance with Byzantium, and thereby the Catholic Church again gained freedom to assert its intellectual superiority.

In the **Visi-Gothic** kingdom Theodoric II. (after the middle of the fifth century) had still entirely felt himself to be a support of the rule of the Romans, and raised his teacher and friend AVITUS (father-in-law of Sidonius Apollinaris) to be Emperor, and in order to lead the Goths to Roman civilization had sought to adjust the opposition between Goths and Romans. Under his successor (his brother and murderer) EURIC, the kingdom reached its greatest extent and exhibited such ordered and secure conditions, that the subject Romans, in spite of the loss of two-thirds of their landed property, found themselves better off than under the intolerable pressure of taxation under the Roman officials. They (and so also the Catholic Church) adhered to their Roman law, while the national law of the Visi-Goths was written down for the first time under Euric. All the same there remained an irreconcilable opposition, and the participation of the Catholic clergy in political efforts² stirred the hatred of the subject people against the Arian Goths. Euric exiled, and even put to death, several Catholic bishops. The opposition of the Catholic Church to Arian rule, however, only became menacing through the appearance of the Fränkish power as the representative of the Catholic faith.

4. The Franks and the Victory of the Catholic Creed among Burgundians, Suevi, and Visi-Goths.

Sources: GREGORY of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, ed. W. Arndt and B. Krusch (Mg. Sc. r. Merov. I.), Hann. 1885. Translated by W. Giesebrecht, 2 vols. 1849-1851, cf. J. W. LOEBELL, *Gregor von Tours und seine Zeit*, 2nd ed. Leipz. 1869.—CASPARI, *Martin von Bracara's Schrift "De correctione rusticorum,"* Christiania 1883.—A. HELFFERICH, *Der Westgothische Arianismus*, 1860.

With the **Franks**, one of the West Germanic tribes enters into

¹ Descriptions after Victor Vitensis 84. *Vid.* in Neander, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Geschichte des Christlichen Lebens*, 3rd ed. 1846, II. 3 sqq.

² *E.g.* the efforts of Sidonius Apollinaris to frustrate the subjection of Auvergne to Visi-Gothic dominion.

the great movement of Church History. Their settlement, like that of the Alamanni, on the Rhine, since the abandonment of the palisade, had repressed, if not entirely abolished the beginnings of the Christian Church which were here already present under Roman rule (*vid.* i. 187). In Gallic history in the middle of the fifth century the **Salic** Franks, received as allies by the Romans, fought along with them under AËTIUS in the **Battle of Châlons** against the Huns, and also further, under their tribal chiefs (kings of districts), served the collapsing Roman dominion in Gaul against the former *fœderati* (Visi-Goths and Burgundians) as well as against external foes. During this period the united kingdom seems to have been formed out of the multiplicity of tribal chiefs. Thus CHILDERIC (457-481), of the family of the **Merovings**, stands as the friend of the Romans, still a heathen indeed, but full of reverence for the Roman Church,¹ so that at that time the provincials under the rule of Arian kings, especially in Burgundy, already looked longingly towards Frankish rule. This relationship extended even beyond Odoacer's shattering of the West-Roman Empire. Childeric's son CHLODWIG (Clovis) (481-511) was the first to take in hand the inheritance of Roman rule in Gaul by dint of his own absolute power. At first only in possession of a portion of the Salic land, as kings of the same race ruled alongside of him, Clovis gained in battle against Syagrius the still remaining Roman province between the Somme, the Seine and the Loire (battle of Soissons, 486), helped, as it appears, his East-Frankish fellow tribesmen against the Thuringians and married (about 493) the Burgundian Princess Clotilda (Chrodichildis), a Catholic Christian, niece of the Arian king Gundobald. Clovis permitted her to baptize their two sons, although the speedy death of the first after baptism had made him hesitate. He conquered the ancient foes, the Alamanni, who menaced the ripuarian Franks, in 496.² Here he had vowed to dedicate himself to Christ, if he should experience His power. By this battle he gained northern Alamania, while the southern, in consequence of the interference of the Ostro-Goth Theodoric, passed under his superiority and protection. The victory was followed on **Christmas** of 496 by the **baptism at Rheims**, by S. Remigius, on which occasion, according to Gregory of Tours, 3,000

¹ Act. S. Genovefæ in Act. SS., Jan. I., 137.

² Züllich, between Bonn and Aix-la-Chapelle, was formerly generally regarded as the site of this battle; more recently the site was sought on the Upper Rhine, meanwhile Arnold (II. 91) again represents the earlier conception; cf. also Friedrich, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, II. 59.

Franks suffered themselves to be baptized along with him.¹ The heir of Roman power in Gaul, who now also planted a firm foot in Germany, appeared as the born protector of the Catholic Church. Avitus of Vienne (in the kingdom of Burgundy) put it in his heart² to convert heathen nations, and the Catholic bishops in the neighbouring kingdoms looked to him with hope. The amalgamation of the Franks with the subject Christian Romans now advanced swiftly. Not only did the securing of the rule require forbearance with social conditions, but the superiority in religion and civilization of the Christian Romans, who formed the majority, involuntarily obtruded itself upon the Franks. Clovis, who now resided in Paris, endowed churches and bishops with property and promoted the building of churches. He humbled Burgundy in battle, forced Gundobald to gentler treatment of the Romans and Catholics, and then, along with the ripuarian Franks, attacked the Visi-Goths: he could not suffer that Arians should still rule in part of Gaul. He conquered the province of Southern Gaul as far as the Garonne and Auvergne, while Burgundy gained the mastery of Provence, which, however, was next won by Theodoric for the Ostro-Gothic rule. The Emperor ANASTASIUS next conferred on him the title of Consul, and Clovis assumed the insignia at Tours with great ceremony. While the Emperor thereby sought to rescue an appearance of superiority, the rule of Clovis acquired a species of legalization in the eyes of his subjects. Ruthlessly, cunningly and cruelly Clovis was now able by the murder of his relations to unite the different Frankish tribes under his rule, and thereby began the horrors which continued to rage in the Merovingian family.³ As Clovis in the last years of his life caused the old *lex Salica* to be revised and published anew, so also, in 511, he summoned a synod to Orleans, which, among other things, regulated how heretical clergy (*e.g.* of the Arian Goths), if they voluntarily returned to the Church, might be received and placed in ecclesiastical offices. Clovis summoned the synod, defined the points to be debated, and the bishops

¹ The legend of the ampulla (Remensis) coming down from heaven is first found in the ninth century in Hincmar.

² Recently the genuineness of the congratulatory letter of Bishop Anastasius of Rome to Clovis (Jaffé, 754), has been denied by HAVET, *Questions Méroving.* 1885.

³ All these crimes were not indeed palliated by the Christian historian Gregory of Tours, but yet in his eyes they were outweighed by his obedience to the true faith, which God rewarded by his successes, "*eo quod ambularet recto corde coram eo, et faceret quæ placita erant in oculis eius,*" Hist. Fr. 2, 40.

sought from him confirmation of their decisions "in order that hereby obedience should be so much the more secured."

The creation of Clovis contained the permanent nucleus of the Germanic re-shaping of the ruins of the Roman Empire, and unity of faith brought together Germans and Romans. In the neighbouring kingdoms also the victorious penetration of the Catholic creed, behind which stood the higher civilization of the subject Roman populace, was thereby furthered. In **Burgundy** Gundobald (Gundobad) in spite of his Arian creed, had stood on terms of close intercourse with the eminent Bishop Avitus of Vienne. In 499 he caused a religious conference between Arian and Catholic clergy to be arranged, which however remained fruitless; the Arian clergy would not allow the matter to be put to a proposed divine ordeal and would have nothing to do with magic. Gundobald remained an Arian till his death in 516, but his son and successor SIGMUND already belonged to the Catholic confession before the beginning of his reign, and the council of the realm called together by him in 517 to **Epaon** was serviceable in carrying through a Catholic arrangement of ecclesiastical affairs. Soon thereafter, however, the Burgundian kingdom succumbed to the attack of the Merovingians and was united with that of the Franks.

In the **kingdom of the Suevi**, KARRARIC, who ascribed the healing of his sick son to the relics of S. Martin brought from Tours, attached himself about 550 to the Catholic creed,¹ for the carrying through of which in Galicia Bishop MARTIN of Dumio (**Bracara**), a Pannonian by birth, was of the greatest influence. This man, filled in the East with the spirit of monastic asceticism, founded in Dumio, near Bracara, the residential city of the kings of the Suevi, a monastery over which he presided as abbot and presbyter, till it was raised to be the seat of a bishopric. At the first Synod of Bracara in 561 (not 563) he took part as Bishop of Dumio, at the second under Miro in 572, as Metropolitan-bishop of Bracara.

When, at the end of the century, the kingdom of the Suevi was incorporated in the **Visi-Gothic kingdom**, the decisive revolution had also already taken place in the latter. King Euric's son ALARIC (from 484) had been unable to overcome by concessions the opposition of the creed. He allowed the Catholic clergy to consider their affairs quite independently at the synods, refrained from influenc-

¹ Gregory of Tours, *De miraculis S. Martini*, I. 11. Isidore (*De regibus Getarum*, c. 90) names THEODEMIR, the Acts of the first synod at Bracara, ARIAMIR. It is doubtful whether these names designate the same person as Karraric, or perhaps his sons.

ing elections, himself elsewhere took up exiled Catholic bishops, and at the same time gave to the Romans, in order to guard against caprice in justice, a Roman law-book of their own (Cod. Theodosianus or *Breviarium Alaricianum*).

In Clovis's war against him, however, the sympathy of the clergy was on the side of the Frankish power. By the battle of Vouglé (507), Aquitaine and Toulouse fell to the Franks; in the following century the Visi-Gothic rule was entirely limited to Spain, and under THEUDAS, who sought to win the Catholic Romans by great favours, as also under ATHANAGILD, whose daughters, on their alliance with Merovingian princes, had forsaken the Arian creed, and in whose time the Suevi returned to the Catholic confession, the signs of the necessary revolution multiplied. Then under LEUVIGILD¹ a vigorous re-action once more took place. In his family the two creeds contended with one another. His sons HERMENEGILD and RECCARED, assumed by him as co-regents, following their mother Theodosia, a Greek princess,² inclined towards the Catholic confession. HERMENEGILD, instigated to a formal transition by his wife, the Frankish INGUNDIS (a daughter of Brunhilda) with the co-operation of Bishop LEANDER of Seville, assembled the Catholic party in Andalusia about him and placed his hopes in the assistance of the Greeks and Franks against his father. Leuvigild now began severe measures against the Catholics, excommunicating resisting bishops and confiscating church property, and caused an Arian council at Toledo to take measures for the conversion of the Catholics, which with many was not without success. He overcame Hermenegild, and when he refused to accept the Arian confession, caused him to be executed. But after Leuvigild's death (586) RECCARED came forward in favour of the Catholic confession. After the disputation between Arian and Catholic bishops at the Assembly at Toledo in 587, he declared himself, moved by weighty reasons "of the heaven and of the earth," in favour of the equality of the Trinity. Most of the Arian bishops and a great part of the Visi-Goths followed him. The opposition of the other party, headed by his step-mother Goswintha, the vigorous enemy of Ingundis, was suppressed, and the great Assembly of Toledo in 589, attended by nearly seventy bishops, confirmed the acceptance of Catholicism by the establishment of the orthodox creed according to the Œcumenical symbols (with exception of the *filioque*) and by the restoration of ecclesiastical

¹ FR. GOERRES in ZhTh. 1873; Id. *L. der letzte Arianerkönig* in JprTh. 1886.

² This is contested by Görres.

order. Reccared supported the building of churches and the founding of monasteries, and the union in creed favoured the amalgamation of Gothic and Roman life, which was further promoted by the permission of the *connubium*.

While the Catholic Church celebrated this triumph, in Italy itself it was sighing under new oppression. After the Ostro-Goths had been subjected to the Greek arms in a twenty years' war of heroic courage, and NARSES had again restored the Byzantine rule, after a short pause, the heavy oppression of the Lombard conquest was laid upon Italy, which proceeded unsparingly, both generally, and also against churches and monasteries. The Arian Christianity of the Lombards, still mingled with much heathenism, by no means as yet dominated the people. Thus the oppression of the Catholic population was much less a matter of religious fanaticism than the outcome of the relation of the barbarian victors to the vanquished. Gregory the Great attests that the godless Arian priests of the Lombards, by no means undertook to persecute the true faith. Indeed, a certain religious indifference made itself felt, and the greater intellectual power of the oppressed Roman Church soon showed itself. The wife of AUTHARI, the Catholic THEODELINDA of Bavaria, who after Authari's death exalted the Duke Agilulf to be king, entered into close alliance with Gregory the Great, and soon here also the process introduced itself, which in the course of the following century led the Lombard masters to the Church of their subjects.

CHAPTER SECOND.

The Visi-Gothic Church in Spain from Reccared's Conversion, and Islam.

Sources: ISIDORI HISP. *De regibus Get.* (p. 31) and *Chronic.* (Ml. 83) and *De scriptoribus eccles.* c. 28 sqq. (Fabr. Bibl. eccles. p. 56.) ILDEFONSUS TOLED. *De scr. eccl.* (ibid. p. 61).—*Literature:* ASCHBACH, *Gesch. der Westgoten.* 1827. LEMKE, *Gesch. von Spanien.* 1831 sqq.—F. DAHN, *Könige der Germanen*, 5th vol. P. G. GAMS, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, II. 2.—DOZY, *Histoire des Musulmans d'Espagne*, Leiden 1861 sqq. BAUDISSIN, *Eulogius und Alvar*, pp. 1–40. VON SCHACK, *Poesie und Kunst der Araber in Spanien und Sicilien*, 2nd ed. 1877, 2nd vol.

THE victory of the Catholic creed over the Arian, for which Bishop LEANDER of Seville was of special influence with Reccared, destroyed the chief wall of partition between the Goths and the Roman populace, and at the same time gave the preponderance to Latin customs, civilisation, and speech along with the Roman clergy. The throne entered into alliance with the spiritual nobility of the Church against the secular nobility of the Goths. But the amalgamation of Goths and Romans led also to the setting aside of Roman law for the latter, and on the other hand to the codification of Visi-Gothic law, into which numerous definitions of Roman law now found entrance (the so-called *Antiqua*). The clergy, now proceeding in large preponderance from the Roman populace, at first surpassed the Visi-Gothic nobility in political power and in authority, and at the synods of the kingdom decided the most important affairs of the latter along with the affairs of the Church, until, after 653, the Paladins appeared along with the bishops. Gradually the higher spiritual dignities came to Gothic families, and the clergy were infected by the factious spirit of the nobility. On account of their wide-spread possessions, the clergy, especially since the reign of the powerful WAMBA (673 sqq.), were summoned to military service. According to the universal Germanic view the kings appointed the bishops. On account of their intimate relations with the rulers the Archbishops of Toledo, the capital of the kingdom, gradually attained the first place and important ecclesiastical privileges, while

at first those of **Seville**, first LEANDER,¹ then his famous brother ISIDORE, had stood at the head. ISIDORE (died in 636) was the most learned man of his time, whose writings collected together the traditional spiritual and secular knowledge then attainable, the inheritance of Roman culture. Rome had greeted the conversion of Reccared with great delight, but the Spanish Church in subsequent times gave rather the impression of a secluded national Church, in which the unity of the Western ecclesiastical world under Rome came to little expression. It held fast to the ancient traditional liturgy, which differed in many points from the Roman order (**Officium Gothicum**, called subsequently the **Mozarabarc Liturgy**), and exercised through the clergy a strong influence on political affairs. Under clerical influence Reccared had already issued most severe regulations against the very numerous Jews of the Visi-Gothic kingdom, aiming at either conversion or annihilation; SISEBUT (from 612) proceeded still more harshly, and still more inhuman measures ensued in the end of the century (694). Still, Jewish money was always able to set limits to their execution.

Amid conflicts of the crown with secular and spiritual dignities, and with quickly increasing moral corruption, the Visi-Gothic kingdom now advanced to its end. WITIZA also interfered with violence in ecclesiastical affairs and, when Pope Constantine (708 sq.) sought to counteract his disregard of the laws and property of the Church, he forbade all intercourse with Rome on pain of death. The nobility and clergy now supported the cause of the pretender RODERIC, and these internal conflicts brought about the interference of the Saracens. MUSA, the procurator of the Caliph Valid I., sent the general Tarik, and the battle of Xeres de la Frontera (7th July, 711) opened Spain to Islam. Its greater part became a province of the Ommeyyad Caliphate, till the latter fell into decay, and the procurators of the Caliphs of Damascus made themselves independent in Spain as well as elsewhere. After the overthrow of the Ommeyyads by the Abbasides (752), who from 768 resided in Bagdad, the last of the Ommeyyads, Abderrhaman I. el Dakkel, founded in Spain in 755 the speedily flourishing Caliphate (at first Emirate) of Cordova.

The position of the subject **Christian population** took very different forms in particular cases; but the subject Christians everywhere found toleration for the exercise of their religion, on condition of humble conduct in regard to the due contribution of the poll-tax. The preponderance of the conquerors compelled many Christians to change their faith, and the Mohammedan law forbade their recon-

¹ F. GÖRRES, *Leander, Bischof von Sevilla*, in *ZwTh.* 1886.

version. Hence many so-called *Christiani occulti* are found. The bishops, suddenly degraded from their influential position in the Visi-Gothic kingdom, either shut themselves up in malignant animosity against the unbelievers, or learned to suit themselves to the Mohammedan wielders of power and so played a part among them. The Arab rulers claimed the rights of the Gothic kings to the filling up of bishoprics and the calling of councils. Christian, Romano-Gothic culture, caught in the bud, received a grievous blow. The state of culture of the externally isolated Christian clergy quickly sank, and among the laity the Latin language partly passed into neglect. On the other hand the lustre of the victorious, quickly developing Arabic civilization, language, eloquence and poesy dazzled and allured, and incited to imitation.

In the north of the peninsula, the mountain country of Asturia and Cantabria as far as the Basques, the Christian rule was maintained by PELAYO of Asturia. Alphonso (the Catholic) united to them the eastern districts of the north coast. Amid continued conflicts with the Moors in the mountains of Gallicia and Old-Castile, the Christian Gothic kingdom, as it was still called, grew strong; Oviedo became its capital under FRUELA (from 757). This Christian Spain under ALPHONSO II. (the Chaste), from 792 came into closer contact with Charlemagne.

CHAPTER THIRD.

Christianity in the British Islands.

Sources: GILDAS, *Liber querulus de excidio Brit.* (Ml. 69) and NENNIUS, *Hist. Brit.* in Th. GALE, *Hist. Brit. script.* Ox. 1691 and ed. Stevenson, Lond. 1838. BEDA, *H. eccl. gent. Angl.* ed. Smith (1722), Stevenson (1838). Holder-Egger (1883).—PATRICI *Confessio* and *Epistola*, Ml. 53, the *vitæ* in COLGAN, *Trias Thaumaturg.* 1645 and in *Acta St.*, 17th March. On Ninian, *Acta St.* 16th Sept., on Columba *ibid.* 9th June.—Jac. USSERIUS, *Antiquitates Brit. Eccles.* London 1687.—*Literature:* C. G. SCHOELL, *De eccl. Britan. Scotorumque hist. fontibus.* Berol. 1851. Id. in RE. 8, 331. LOOFS, *Antique Brit. Scotorumque eccles. quales fuerint mores.* Lips. 1882. W. SKENE, *Celtic Scotland*, 3 vols., Edinb. 1876–78. BRIGHT, *Chapters of Early English Church-history*, Oxford 1878.

1. THE Church had planted a firm foot in Celtic Britain (*vid.* i. 106, 186) which had become a Roman province. In the fourth century British bishops took part in synods of the Empire; this seems to have been the flourishing period of the ancient British-Roman Church. But from as early as 360 began the inroads of the Picts from the North, and the Scots from Ireland, and after the hard pressed Roman Empire had completely given up the province in 409, the invading Angles, Jutes and Saxons began to settle as masters. In the north of the island, amid the existing mixture of the Britons with the invading Picts, NINIAN, a Briton educated in Rome, seems to have worked among the southern Picts. To him is attributed the foundation of the church of **Candida Casa**, which was dedicated to S. Martin of Tours. It is to be sought at Whit-horn in Galloway on the south-west coast, somewhat facing the Isle of Man. It is hard to say how far his activity was of permanent consequence. We still find the British Church in the beginning of the fifth century in harmonious intercourse, especially with that of Gaul.

The relationship also in the liturgy, lessons, etc., with the Gaulish Church speaks for the influences which proceeded thence upon Celtic Britain; *vid.* WARREN, *Liturgic and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, Oxf. 1881. Cf. also in regard to the baptismal confession, Loofs l.c. p. 11 note. At the time of the Pelagian controversy, Bishop GERMANUS of Auxerre, at the instigation of the Roman emissary Palladius and on the commission of Pope Celestine, twice led a mission to Britain, in order to oppose Pelagianism in person there. In FASTIDIUS (*vid.*

CASPARI, *Briefe u. Abhdlgn.* etc., Christiania 1890, pp. 353-375) the author of a treatise *De vita Christiana* (ML. 50, 2 col. 383 sqq.), we make the acquaintance of a born Briton, whose treatise, praised by Gennadius (*De om. ill.* 56), exhibits Pelagian influences. But the settlement of the **Anglo-Saxons** forced back the Britons into the western part of Britain (Wales and the mountains of Northumberland and Cornwall) and in part across the sea (Britanny). While the latter seek attachment to the Church of Gaul, the British Church dragged out a troubled existence in an isolated position, and yet gained a certain rise in prosperity in the sixth century (battle of Bath in 516). The complaints of GILDAS reflect the barbarism and distress of the time. But admirable bishops were not wanting, as is shown, along with Gildas, by Bishop Daniel of Bangor († 584), David of Menevia (S. David's), Kentigern of Glasgow, Asaph and others.

2. But about the same period of the Saxon conquests the Christian Church begins to strike root in **Ireland** (Erin, Scotia Magna), the original seat of the Scots. About 431 Pope Celestine sent PALLADIUS to Ireland, of whose action, however, little is to be said with certainty. On the other hand native tradition surrounds S. Patrick with the full glory of the apostle of the Irish. Basing upon the remarkable entire silence of Bede as to him, and on other grounds, it has indeed been attempted to deny entirely his historical existence, or to declare him to be one and the same person with the above-mentioned Roman Palladius, but hardly with justification. The written compositions ascribed to S. Patrick, preserved only in a very corrupt text, the Confession and a letter to a British chieftain who had robbed Irish Christians, bear in a very high degree the mark of originality, and even in language are strongly distinguished from other writings which are erroneously ascribed to him. No miracles, of which later tradition ascribed innumerable to him, are mentioned; on the other hand there is exhibited a strong life of religious feeling which expresses itself in visions and divine revelations in dreams. According to his Confession Patrick was the son of a deacon, Calpornius, and born on the paternal property Bannavem Taberniæ, which is to be sought in Roman Britain; as a child he was carried off to Ireland, and had there to herd sheep. The religious feelings which had been awakened in solitude, subsequently, when he had succeeded in reaching his home, left him no rest; he brought the Gospel to the **Scots** of Ireland. In his Confession, which was probably written towards the end of his life, he vindicates himself for not being able to desert the converts in Ireland. God had given him the grace, to convert many people and to appoint clergy; the sons of the Scots became monks, the daughters of the kings virgins dedicated to Christ. The founding of the church at **Armagh** is traced back to him, but the compass and continuance of his

activity lie much in the dark. The gaining of individual heads of clans led to the founding of churches and the appointment of bishops. We must probably conceive of the activity of Patrick essentially after the manner of the British Church, while there are also traces of relationship to the Church of Gaul. On the other hand he must have been influenced by the ministry of NINIAN in Candida Casa (*magnum monasterium*), from which further influences seem to have gone forth, especially to the **North** of Ireland, but on the other hand the **British Church of Wales** influenced Southern Ireland. But politico-social circumstances among the Scots brought about that peculiar state of matters, which made the Church in the specific sense a **monastic Church**. Monasteries are not only the centres of this mission, but they also bear the character of Christian colonies, which adapt themselves in a peculiar manner to the clan-system which entirely dominates the people. The founders receive from the chieftain landed property, which descends as an inheritance in their family, so long as a member of the family is capable, even though only in a subordinate spiritual office, of retaining the monastery. With the grant the Church also acquires claims on the people of the clan. They enter into a family relationship to the monastery and have to render services to the Church through individual persons. But the latter are thereby advanced to a privileged position, the unfree thereby become free, people of low rank receive higher esteem; on the other hand the Church is bound to afford baptism, communion and masses for souls, as well as the preaching of the word of God, to the members of the clan.

These Christian, monastic communities form not a **hierarchically constituted, united Church, but only alliances loosely touching one another, which reach as far as the foundations which have started from one centre**. There thus arise in the individual clan societies, Christian communities, in which the converted and tonsured brothers enjoy the privileges conferred, **without otherwise altering their essential relation to the clan**. In these monastic communities, simple settlements in wooden huts and provided with a church, the older members (*seniores*) occupy themselves with contemplation, the conduct of divine service and the copying of Scripture, but besides especially with the education of the younger members (*juniores* or *alumni*). Alongside of them however there are working brothers, on whom agriculture and handicrafts are incumbent. These mission-monasteries or Christian colonies naturally also require ordained priests for divine service. The abbots, however, might be mere presbyters, and as a fact frequently are so, and their social position

involves that they should receive the leadership of the Church not by election but by a kind of right of inheritance from the family of the founder. For those spiritual functions, which are bound to the episcopal *potestas ordinis*, the presence of consecrated bishops was required in these monastic communities, and thus there arises the peculiar circumstance, that the bishops, who stood higher in spiritual rank, might yet be subject to the government of monastic abbots.

Among the great national monastic foundations of the sixth century that of FINNIAN, the monastery of **Clonard** (Cluain-Erard) in Meath is pre-eminent. To it 3,000 monks are said to have belonged, *i.e.* in different monastic settlements which were all dependent on Clonard. Finnian went out from Wales under the influence of the famous David (founder of S. David's) and of Gildas, known by his descriptions of the miseries of the British Church under the invasions of the Saxons. From Clonard, the twelve apostles of Ireland, who founded monasteries in the whole country, are said to have gone out; to them belongs the famous **Bennchar** (Bangor), which is not to be confounded with the bishopric of Bangor in Wales.

From this Irish-Scottish Church there proceeded especially the conversion of the **Scots** and **Picts** in Scotland, the ancient **Albany**. To the oldest population of Scotland, the likewise Celtic Picts, the **Scots** had come from Ireland, and being still further increased by later immigrations in the beginning of the sixth century, settled in the south-western part of Scotland, while the Picts retained the eastern and northern part, and in the course of the sixth century, even to a considerable extent forced back the invading Scots. The Scots here formed the small, in name at least, Christian, kingdom of **Dalriada**.

In connection herewith stands the noble ministry of the Irish-Scot COLUMBA, who, proceeding from Bangor, as a presbyter, with twelve companions, founded a monastic settlement on the island of **Hii** (I, or Ia) about 563, usually called St. Iona,¹ which was presented to him by CONAL, the King of the Scots. From this centre Columba pursued the mission in Scotland and the Hebrides, among the heathen Picts, whose king BRUDE he won; indeed, he is said to have come as far as the Orkney Islands. Columba remained at the head of the monasteries founded by him in Ireland and now at Iona and their numerous branches, and so the Church in Caledonia came under his, the Abbot-Presbyter's, leadership, for Iona formed the governing centre for the whole Church of the Pictish kingdom, as later also for

¹ According to Reeves, Iona was originally the adjective form of Ia, and thence by a mere slip of the pen arose the usual name Iona. The island belongs to the southern or inner Hebrides, and now bears the name Icolmkill, *i.e.* Island of Columba, who already in ancient times bore the name Columcille.

Northumbria. The peculiar leadership of this mission church exercised by the Abbot of the Monastery of Hii, who was a simple presbyter, has led to the erroneous supposition that this church in general knew no essential difference in clerical character between bishop and presbyter. But we also find here the peculiar *potestas ordinis* of the episcopate, according to which certain spiritual functions are thoroughly linked to episcopal consecration. The leadership of the church, on the other hand, lies in the power of the monasteries, the abbots of which are sometimes bishops and sometimes presbyters.

Other peculiar arrangements and institutions were maintained and peculiarly developed both by the isolated ancient British Church, the episcopate of which, for the rest, bears quite the same character as those in other Roman provinces, and by the Irish-Scottish monastic and mission church. In their isolated position both only partially followed the development of the Roman Church of the Empire. They maintained the earlier reckoning of Easter (the older Roman, pre-Dionysian), and had a peculiar style of tonsure, from ear to ear, whereby the front part of the head was shorn, but behind, the hair hung down long, which was quite different from the so-called Roman *corona*. Moreover, the rite of baptism was different, in what respect is not clear; other liturgical peculiarities are also found here. The **marriage of priests**, and that of bishops also, was held legal in the ancient fashion.

3. The Anglo-Saxon Church and its relation to the Ancient British Church.

During these missionary efforts the erstwhile Roman Britain, which was already laid hold of by Christianity, had fallen into the hands of its heathen German conquerors. Gregory the Great, however, before his entry upon the Roman episcopate, directed his attention to the **Anglo-Saxons**. As Pope, in 596, he sent Abbot AUGUSTINE with forty Benedictines through Gaul to Britain; the Frankish court supported the undertaking with interpreters and recommendations to ETHELBERT of Kent, who had for wife the Frankish Bertha, a Christian. The Germanic conquerors (Angles, Saxons and Jutes) formed a great number of governments, but temporarily bound themselves together in a common league. At that time Ethelbert of Kent stood as "Bretwalda" at the head of the Heptarchy. The Roman emissaries, landing on the **Isle of Thanet**, not far from the mouth of the Thames, were friendly received by Ethelbert, and as early as 597 were able to baptize him at Durovernum (= Cantuaria, Cantia, *i.e.* Canterbury). A great part of his

subjects followed his example. Augustine obtained episcopal consecration in Arles, restored an ancient church dedicated to St. Martin of Tours in Durovernum, and built a new one, dedicated to Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, at the same time with a monastery. For the support of the work Gregory sent the Abbot MELLITUS and others, and promoted Augustine to be an Archbishop. Even then Londinum in the south and Eboracum (York) in the north were regarded as metropolises, but as London was in heathen hands, **Canterbury** became the archi-episcopal see instead. Moreover, Gregory gave Augustine very liberal instructions as to his treatment of the new converts. The idol-temples, instead of being destroyed, as was at first intended, were rather to be transformed into Christian churches, and for the sacrificial feasts which had grown into the hearts of the people, the consecration of churches and feasts of martyrs were to be substituted.

Augustine sought in vain to bring about a union, for common action, with the ancient British Church, especially with Wales (*vid. infra*). Shortly before his death, under SABARETH, **Essex**, which lay north from Kent and was independent of it, but less important, was opened to Christian preaching, and here he installed MELLITUS as Bishop of **London**. In the western part of Kent itself **Rochester** became the seat of a bishopric (JUSTUS). When Augustine died in 605, LAURENTIUS succeeded him as archbishop, but by Ethelbert's death in 606 this mission was once more placed in a dubious position, as his son EADBALD again attached himself to heathenism, and drew along with him a great part of those who had been won. Even Mellitus of London and Justus of Rochester gave up the affair as lost, and had already embarked, when at the last moment Laurentius succeeded in changing Eadbald's opinion. Mellitus returned, and subsequently succeeded Laurentius as Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Northumbrian prince EADWIN, exiled by his relation Æthelfried, after various fortunes, had found reception with REDWALD of **East Anglia**, who, on his own part, was not without inclination to Christianity, but was restrained by the opinion of the people. With Redwald's help, Eadwin succeeded in obtaining the mastery of Northumbria. Married to a Kentish princess, from 625 he permitted PAULINUS to preach the gospel, and finally decided to adopt it. After solemn deliberation with the assembly of his kingdom, the acceptance of Christianity followed in 627. The high priest destroyed the altar of Wodan with his own hand, Eadwin had himself baptized (he is the founder of Eadwinburg = Edinburgh), and PAULINUS became the Archbishop of the ancient Roman city of York

(Eboracum). Subsequent times still praised the Christian government of Eadwin. But Eadwin fell in 633 in the war of defence against the still heathen **Mercia**, which was allied with the Briton Cadwalla; a Christian, but hostile to the Saxons, and with him fell the Roman mission. His brother EANFRIED, King of Bernicia, who, out of respect to King PENDA of Mercia, had repudiated the Christian faith which he had gained in Scotland, was also at that time, like his brother, reduced to subjection to the Briton Cadwalla. Eanfried's son OSWALD, won to Christianity in the Monastery of Iona, now obtained the lordship of Northumbria, after the conquest of Cadwalla, but it was now **Scottish Christianity**, which was here planted, **not the Roman**. The Scot AIDAN was sent out as missionary bishop from the central monastery, and founded a monastery as a mission centre on the island of **Lindisfarne** (now Holy Island, on the east coast of Northumberland, south of Berwick and the mouth of the Tweed).

Meanwhile SIGEBERT, Redwald's step-son, who had received a Christian education in France, supported by the Burgundian priest Felix, had worked for Christianization in East Anglia in 631. Dunwich, on the sea-coast (now washed away by the sea) became a bishopric. After Sigebert, who had retired into a monastery, had been placed in the battle field by his own friends, in the war against Penda, and had been cut down without defending himself, there succeeded the zealous king ANNA, who was devoted to the faith, and whose whole family was distinguished by special zeal for the monastic life.—In **Wessex**, IRINUS, who was sent out by Pope Honorius, worked from the year 634. Under the influence of OSWALD of Northumbria, he brought to baptism King Cynegil, whose daughter Oswald married. In **Mercia**, the warlike PENDA, who was at war with nearly all of the Anglo-Saxon rulers in succession, opposed Christianity most tenaciously. In war with him in 642 the influential Oswald of Northumbria fell, but his brother and successor Oswy held zealously by Christianity, and under his influence, Essex also, thirty-six years after the first attempt, now received Christianity under Sigebert the Good. From Bishop FINAN in Lindisfarne he received the Scottish monk CEDD, who now became Bishop of London. Finally Oswy, as Bretwalda, now overcame his tenacious opponent Penda, in 656, and his son PEADA agreed to accept Christianity. **Lichfield** here became the seat of a bishopric. Still later the unimportant and isolated Sussex followed.

The course of the mission shows how two varying forms of Christianity, the Scottish and the Roman, here meet, and how, after the

Roman beginning, the Scottish in growing measure asserted itself from the north.

At the same time, however, the relation of the ancient British Church to the new Roman is to be distinguished from that of the Irish-Scottish Church to the same. The latter had taken over certain usages from the ancient British Church, but was divided from it by its peculiar development of the monastic life, and herein, especially in view of the great importance which Iona acquired as the head of the numerous monastic societies, was involved a difficulty with respect to the views of the Roman hierarchy. The former however, although in its foundations standing nearer to the more recent Roman mission, from acute **national** antipathy to its **Anglo-Saxon oppressors**, resisted the request to co-operate with the new Roman emissaries in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, and accommodate itself to their principles.

Immediately after his settlement in Kent, Augustine entered into negotiations with the British clergy in Wales (the meeting on the frontier at Augustine's Oak in 601). So likewise did Laurentius subsequently. But the ancient British Church in Wales, so far as the latter remained independent of the Anglo-Saxons, persisted in its opposition, which was only gradually overcome in the second half of the eighth century. On the other hand, Pope Honorius obtained the adherence of a portion of southern Ireland to the Roman celebration of Easter as early as 630. But here also the agreement did not extend further.

But in the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms the importance of the union of the two parties, the Irish-Scottish and the Roman, which were often combating one another in one and the same place, was always more and more felt. King Oswy of Northumberland had, since 657, extended his rule over the Britons of **Strathclyde**, the southern Picts and the Scots of **Dalriada**. The two parties collided in his family; for his wife had been won over to the Roman view by Abbot WILFRIED, the most tenacious representative of the Roman endeavours. Oswy, who at that time, as Bretwalda, stood at the head of the Saxon dominions, according to an agreement with the rest of the princes, summoned a **Synod** to the monastery of **Streaneshalch** (Sinus Phari, hence Synodus Pharensis, *i.e.* Whitby, near York) in 664. The authority of the Holy Father **Columba**, which was brought into controversy by COLMAN, the hitherto Bishop of Lindisfarne, was successfully encountered by that of the Holy Apostle PETER, to whom the Lord gave the keys of heaven, and the Roman system was accepted in obedience to the prince of the

apostles. Colman retired to the monastery of Hii, and also worked elsewhere; other clergy submitted. In this way there here fell away a mode of ecclesiastical activity, to which Bede, who was devoted to the Roman Church, could not but give favourable testimony on account of its simplicity, disinterestedness and faithful devotion to the care of souls and preaching (H. E. 3, 26). In Colman's place, Cuthbert now carried out the new Roman forms.¹ The Roman Bishop VITALIAN celebrated this triumph, the same who, in the Monothelete controversy, was only just able to assert himself against Constantinople.

The attachment of the powerful Heptarchy to the Church of Rome was bound to re-act also on the Irish and Scottish Church. Although the northern districts repudiated the dominion of the Angles of Northumberland about 685, and in this way the Church of Columba again became free in its movements among the Southern Picts and in the Scottish Dalriada, the then Abbot of Iona, ADAMNAN (the biographer of Columba), allowed himself to be gained over to the Roman system in Northumberland, and worked in this interest with success both in the north of Ireland and among the Britons of Strathclyde, in spite of obstinate opposition on the part of the monks; he was soon followed by the Scottish King Naithan, who commanded his subjects to receive the Roman ordinances, and caused the entire body of the priesthood to be shorn according to the Roman tonsure. The parent monastery of Hii still held fast to its past. After Adamnan's death in 704, an abbot of another family succeeded, for the first time since the foundation by Columba, and in the immediate future discordant elections of abbots seem to have followed. It was not till 716 that the monk Egbert had the good fortune to gain the monks for Roman Christianity.

The victory of the Roman ecclesiastical system over the Scottish first extended the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury over the whole Anglo-Saxon Church under Archbishop THEODORE of Tarsus (from 668) and his next successors. Abbot Wilfried sought in vain, with great tenacity and in lively personal intercourse with Rome, to vindicate the claims of York and at the same time his own, in accordance with the original intentions of Gregory the Great. It was only when, in 735, a Northumbrian prince Egbert was nominated Archbishop of York and received the pallium from Rome, that the views of Rome became victorious, according to which, instead of the **one** Anglo-Saxon Primate, Canterbury and York were to share ecclesiastical power and hold the balance between them. The attempt of King Offa of Mercia to erect a third archbishopric of Lichfield for this province, did indeed receive the assent of Pope Hadrian I., but the creation was of short duration.

For the carrying out of the Roman order, the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline and the promotion of the higher clerical culture, the action of Archbishop THEODORE (668-690), a man who also sought to bring the study of the Greek language to England, was especially important. Monasteries and monastic schools were the chief centres of this Anglo-Saxon Christian culture, as in

¹ *Vid. Beda, Vita Cudbercti.*

general, along with the seats of bishops, the real centres of Christianity. Bede (first half of the eighth century) still exerted himself in increasing the number of presbyters in the see of York. In many places in the mountains of Northumberland the preaching of the gospel had never yet resounded, although the church-taxes were exacted.

The filling up of bishoprics, as well as the confirmation of the decisions of synods and the final judicature over the clergy were exercised by the Anglo-Saxon rulers as their national rights. But the authority of the Roman see, the founder of the Anglo-Saxon Church, formed a certain protection against too violent attacks of the secular power, while at the same time, among the Anglo-Saxon princes and tribes, there soon arose a great reverence for the Prince of the Apostles. Princes and princesses passed in great numbers into the cloister, others into the clerical career. Following the example of their magnates, many Anglo-Saxons made pilgrimage to Rome. Connected therewith was the so-called *denarius Sancti Petri* (Peter's penny, Roman tribute), which was originally intended to serve the *Schola Saxonica* in Rome, *i.e.* not for educational purposes, but for the support and lodging of the numerous Saxon pilgrims. The tax, which is said to have been founded by King Ina of Wessex on his pilgrimage to Rome, can however only be traced back with certainty to King Offa of Mercia, who exchanged the crown for the cowl at Rome in 790.

The **monasteries**, richly endowed, all stood under episcopal supervision, but had also to be protected by synodical decisions against arbitrary attacks of the bishops and against their covetousness. Naturally also, on the secular side, on account of their abundant resources, heavy claims were made on them for public services, such as for military service and providing lodging for the king. Nobles took possession of the abbacies and lived at heck and manger under the protection of the tonsure. Bede complained of these abuses, and desired that such monasteries should be transformed into bishoprics in the interest of the Church.

Christianity, which had now been vigorously taken up by the Anglo-Saxon nationality, now also awakened an **Anglo-Saxon Christian Literature**. The language, hitherto living in national song, became a written language. Missionary preaching was obliged to make use of the language of the country, either by preachers or interpreters, the elements of the faith had to be given to the people in their own tongue, and in this way the latter also attained its place in the liturgy. The Synod of **Cloveshove** (747) required of presbyters that they should be able to repeat the Lord's Prayer, the words of the Mass and the Creed, in Saxon. The monk CÆDMON († 680), according to the narrative of Bede (*Hist. Eccl.* 4, 23), a singer from among the people, who had been received as a lay-brother into the monastery of Streaneshalch by the Abbess Hilda, sang out of Genesis and Exodus, and on the Incarnation of Christ, His Passion and Ascension. Anglo-Saxon poetical paraphrases of biblical stories are ascribed to him with doubtful correctness; a hymn on the Creation, in the Northumbrian dialect, most probably originated with him.¹ About the same time there was an Anglo-Saxon translation of the Four Gospels by ÆLDRED. ALDHELM († 709) translated the Psalms, Bede the Gospel of John. The heroic poem of Beowulf

¹ Preserved in a MS. of Bede's *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Angl.* Cf. Zupitza, *Altengl. Übungsbuch*, 2nd ed. Wien 1881.

received its present form under Christian revision. As of old the Irish, so now the Anglo-Saxon monasteries became the chief schools of Christian culture, the most eminent representative of which is the Venerable BEDE. He was born on a property belonging to the monastery of Wiremouth (now Jarrow in Northumberland), was educated as a monk, and finally became a presbyter. He attained no higher ecclesiastical dignity, but this most learned of Western men completely embraced the attainable knowledge of his time († 735).

CHAPTER FOURTH.

The Frankish Kingdom and Christian Missions in Germany, Friesland, etc., before Boniface.

Sources : for the general history of the age: GREGORY of Tours, *vid.* p. 36, and FREDEGARIUS, *Chron.* etc. ed. Krusch, Hann. 1888 (MG. Ser. Mer. II.). *Literature* : ARNDT, *Annalen des fränkischen Reichs im Zeitalter der Merovinger*, Halle 1873.—F. W. RETTBERG, *K.G. Deutschlands bis Karl d. Gr.*, 2 vols., 1846-48 (fundamental). I. FRIEDRICH, *K.G. Deutschlands*, 2 vols., Bamberg 1867. A. HAUCK, *K.G. Deutschlands*, vol. i., Leipsic 1887. J. H. EBRARD, *Die iro-schottische Missionskirche*, Gütersloh 1873.

THE expansion of the Frankish kingdom in Gaul by the forcing back and subjection of the Burgundian kingdom and of Provence on the one hand, and by union with the Ripuarian Franks on the other, finally by the subjection of the Thuringians, Alamanni, and Bavarians to a greater or lesser degree of dependence, was at the same time an expansion of the influence of the Catholic-Christian Church. It is true that this involved the corollary that Christianity appeared to the hitherto still heathen German tribes as the **Frankish religion**, and its fortunes were conditioned by their friendly or unfriendly attitude to the Frankish rule.

1. The Irish-Scottish Mission in the Frankish Kingdom and in Alamannia.

Sources : JONAS Ab. Bobb., *Vita S. Columban*, and his *Vitæ* of Columban's disciples Attala, Eustasius, and Burgundofara in MABILL. AS. II. Columba's *Vita* and the writings attributed to him MI. 80.—The little to be trusted *Vitæ* of FRIDOLIN, TRUDPERT, and PIRMIN, in MONE, *Quellensammlung f. d. bad. Landesgeschichte*, I. Karlsruhe 1848 (cf. Rettberg and Wattenbach, I. 114, 259, 5th ed.). HRABAN, *Pirmin's Grabchrift* in MG. *Poetæ lat. m. ævi*, II. 224. Literature on Columba: HERTEL, *ZhTh.* 1875.

At first under the Salic Franks much heathenism still remained to be gradually overcome, and in Austrasia in general Christianization did not begin till the seventh century. It was of special importance, that towards the end of the sixth century, zealous **Irish-Scottish priests and monks**, driven by the powerful wandering impulse, came to the Continent and founded monasteries, and began to conduct mission-work both in the Frankish kingdom and on German soil. COLUMBA the Younger (COLUMBANUS), born in the south-east of

Ireland before the middle of the sixth century, and seized in his early youth by the power of the idea of asceticism, entered the monastery of Bangor under Abbot Comgall. But the divine call to leave his native land for Christ's sake, drove him abroad, in spite of the initial opposition of his abbot. He landed in Brittany, where he found a kindred people, but betook himself to the Franks, whose Christianity appeared to him very external. King GUNTFRAM of Burgundy made over to him, about 584, the decayed town of **Anegray** (Anagrates) on the frontier of Burgundy and Austria, on the south-western slope of the Vosges. Columba had started at first with twelve brethren, but the great number of those who now gathered about him occasioned the foundation of the neighbouring monastery of **Luxeuil** (Luxovium), to which a third was added in **Fontaines** (Fontanas). Columba founded his monasteries, as it seems, without the permission of the Bishop of Besançon, and also kept the branch establishments dependent on himself, against the Gaulish tradition. The appearance of these foreign monks and offence at their celebration of Easter, which differed from the Gaulish and Roman observance, led to serious controversies with the Frankish bishops. Nevertheless his monasteries exercised a far-reaching influence on the circumstances of the Frankish Church (*vid. infra*). Columba fell into enmity with the Queen Brunichildis and Theuderic of Burgundy, the latter of whom he sharply opposed on account of his immoral life. Brunichildis stirred up the old Frankish antipathy against the Scottish celebration of Easter and against the peculiar monastic arrangements of the Scots. After about ten years' residence in the Vosges, Columba was taken prisoner, with a view of sending him home by sea. He was however allowed to escape, and he turned to Clotaire II. (of Neustria). As soon thereafter Clotaire II. united Burgundy and Austrasia with Neustria, the continued existence of Luxovium was secured. Columba intended to go with his companions to Italy, but Theudebert II. of Cologne sought to retain him in the Austrasian dominion and sent him to **Alamannia**.

The **Alamanni** had settled after the middle of the third century in the so-called *Agri Decumates*, and in the fifth century had pressed forward on the left bank of the Rhine also, and southwards as far as the slopes of the Alps, the Lake of Geneva and the Jura, and eastward in Vindelicia as far as the Lech. In these districts they had come into contact with Christian foundations of the Roman time, as the destruction of existing churches by the Germans did not exclude a certain survival of Christian churches and foundations.

Thus in **Augsburg** (Augusta Vindelicorum) the veneration of S. Afra is based upon connection with ancient Roman Christianity; also **Windisch** (Vindonissa), **Augst** (Augusta Rauracorum) and **Chur** probably maintained their existence through the storms of the barbarian migrations. But on the whole the Alamanni were still heathen, and remained so, even after Clovis had subjected the greater part of them in the battle of Zülpich (496), and in 536 the southern portion (till that time dependent on the Ostro-goths) also fell to the empire of the Austrasian Franks. But in alliance with the Christian Frankish empire the remains of Christian establishments of the time of the Romans regained life. We find a Bishop of Vindonissa at Frankish synods till towards the middle of the sixth century. The bishopric seems to survive in that of **Constance**, which shortly made its appearance, while the old Roman bishopric of **Augst** survives in that of **Bâle**. At the end of the sixth century the attachment of the bishoprics of **Augsburg** and **Tiburnia** (Teurnia on the Upper Drave in Carinthia) to the Frankish metropolitan alliance is mentioned.¹ **Strassburg** quickly becomes flourishing under the Merovingians, and soon becomes an episcopal city. The Merovingian properties, farms, and courts of justice which were scattered over the land, as well as service in the army and the alliance of the nobility with the court, did their share in procuring entrance for Christian elements. The Dukes of the Alamanni accepted the Christian faith earlier than the greater part of their people.

After COLUMBA had been obliged to leave Luxeuil, under favour of Theudebert II., he ascended the Rhine along with a number of monks who had fled from Luxeuil (among them, Gallus), and worked first on the Lake of Zürich (Tucconia, Tuggen in the neighbourhood of the lake), and then for several years on the Lake of Constance (Bregenz); here he found a Christian priest already. But after three years he turned, in accordance with his former intention, towards Italy, where he founded the monastery of **Bobbio** on the Trebbia. By the death of Theudebert in 612, Austrasia had fallen for a short period to Theuderic (Columba's old opponent). When in 613 Clotaire II. of Neustria became lord of the whole kingdom, he invited Columba to return, but in vain. Columba died soon after the founding of Bobbio in 615.

One of his companions, the Irish GALLUS, had remained behind in Alamannia and had built for himself and his comrades a hermitage on the Steinach, the subsequent **S. Gall**. He won the favour of the Duke GUNZO, and with great command of the German language, worked in close alliance with the priests of the existing Christian Church. The bishopric of Constance is said to have been offered to, but rejected by him. He does not seem to have died till after 645.² Of his pupils, Maginald, who succeeded him in the leadership of the monastic community, and Theodore are mentioned; the former is

¹ Mansi, x. 446.

² *Vid.* Hauck, I. 308 against Friedrich, who places his death much earlier.

said to have founded the monastery of Füssen, the latter, Kempten, but both are later foundations. The question as to the time of the activity of the Irish monk FRIDOLIN ("a Scottish name in a Frankish form," Wattenbach), the founder of the monastery of Säckingen (on an island in the Rhine near Bâle), remains quite obscure; the same holds good of the Irish TRUDPERT, from whom the abbey south of Freiburg in Breisgau bears its name.

The revision of the Alamannian law undertaken in the reign of Clotaire II.¹ (MGL. III. 10 sqq.), presupposes the existence of bishoprics, parishes, churches and monasteries, and of church landed property, which is tilled by slaves or vassals, but also a mingling of Christian and non-Christian elements, and seems to aim at a closer alliance of the Alamanni with the Frankish kingdom, and a strengthening of the church among the still partially heathen people. The repeated campaigns of the second Pippin, and his son Charles Martel, led to a closer union of Alamannia with Austrasia.

Under Charles Martel lived the abbot and bishop PIRMIN, who can hardly have been a Frankish priest (Rettberg), rather an Anglo-Saxon or an Irishman.² He founded the famous monastery of **Reichenau**, on a western continuation of the lake of Constance (the Unter- or Zeller-see). On account of the enmity of the duke to Charles Martel, Pirmin was obliged to leave Reichenau, and worked in Alsace, where he established the monastery of **Murbach**, founded by Count Eberhard, and died in 753 in the monastery of Hornbach, likewise founded by him in the diocese of Metz. The monasteries founded by him formed a close alliance. The abbots were only to be taken from these monasteries, bound to the rule of Benedict, and the monasteries of this close alliance were to exercise a mutual right of reformation.

¹ If not under Clotaire III., as Stälin would think.

² Hraban's epitaph and the designation of the monks in the documents, as *congregatio peregrinorum*, point to the idea of some one from over seas, and since Pirmin introduced the Benedictine rule, Hauck thinks it impossible to think of a Scot, but only of an Anglo-Saxon. But *vid infra*.

2. Bavaria.

Sources : JONAS Bobb. *Vita Eustasii* in Mabillon A.S. II. 116. *Gesta S. Hrodberti confessoris* in Arch. f. Oe. G. vol. 63, and the so-called *Vita primigenia* (appended to the *De conversione Bagoariorum*, MGS. XI. 4). ARIBO FRIS. *Vita* EMMERANI in ASB. Sept. vi. 474 and ejdm. *Vita* CORBINIANI, *ibid.* Sept. iii. 281. Literature : S. RIEZLER, *G. Baierns*, I. 1878. A. HUBER, *G. d. Einf. u. Verbr. d. Chr. in Südostdeutschl.*, 4 vols. Salzburg 1874 sqq. (rich in matter, but uncritical).

The Roman province of Noricum, after the confused times from the middle of the fifth century, in which the venerable monk SEVERINUS († 477) exercised his beneficent activity (*vid.* i. 389 sqq.), had finally been given up by Odoacer. The BOJOARIANS (most probably the ancient Marcomanni) then settled themselves firmly in the country. Roman population survived not only in the south of Noricum, till the Slavs, pressing in on the south-east, annihilated Roman life, and in Tyrol, here throughout the entire Middle Ages, but also in considerable remnants in the north of Noricum, so also in Salzburg and the Alpine valleys, as far as the Lake of Constance. **Regensburg** (Ratisbon) was never destroyed, and everywhere on the high plain between the Danube and the Alps, a sparse foreign populace maintained itself, which, along with the Latin tongue, retained the Christian faith and the old saints of the Roman time. There was thus found here a strong mixture of Catholic Romans, and heathen and Arian Germans alongside of one another, which had existed from the very first, when in the end of the sixth century Bavaria became dependent on the Frankish kingdom. The **Agilulfs**, a Frankish¹ family which confessed Catholic Christianity, received the dignity of the dukedom. Hence new missionary efforts now proceed also from the Frankish Church.

EUSTASIUS, the successor of Columba in Luxovium, worked in Bavaria and had trouble with heathenism and Arianism; after him also the monk AGRETIUS. In the course of the seventh century the Christianizing of Bavaria must have made not inconsiderable strides, although after Dagobert's death the alliance of the country with the Frankish empire dissolved, and the Bavarian dukes felt themselves to be independent lords of the land. In the end of the century Duke THEODO worked for Christian foundations. The supplement to the Bavarian law (titles 8-22), in which reference is made to ecclesiastical relationships, is also attributed to him. He appointed, with a view to regulating the affairs of the church, which were in a very imperfect state, in the time of King Childebert III. (695-711), Bishop RUPERT of Worms,² who was related to the Merovingian royal house. In Childebert's second year, Rupert came to Ratisbon to Theodo, and founded in Salzburg, on the ruins of the ancient Roman city of Juvavum, the monastery of S. Peter, and consecrated churches and priests. But Salzburg did not become

¹ According to Riezler.

² The controversy as to the date of Saint Rupert may now be regarded as decided, although Huber still stands out for the higher antiquity.

through him an episcopal city, but remained a monastery; he had successors, not as bishop, but as Abbot of S. Peter's. Of EMMERAN, Bishop of Poitiers, it may be maintained, that in the beginning of the eighth century, purposing to go through Bavaria to the Avars, he was detained by Theodo, founded a monastery at Ratisbon, and from unknown causes found there a violent death. His foundation survived; a bishop Erhardt is mentioned in Ratisbon. Where the Scots may have worked alongside of Rupert and Emmeran we do not know, but they must have exercised a wider activity than these Frankish missionaries.

Duke Theodo visited Rome in the year 716, as the first of his race, and in consequence of his negotiations with Pope Gregory II. the latter issued an instruction¹ to the bishop Martinian, the presbyter Georgius, and the sub-deacon Dorotheus. The institution of bishops in the provinces and of an archbishop at the head, here kept in view, seems to take account of the partition, which took place before Theodo's journey to Rome, of the Bavarian domain between Theodo (Ratisbon) and his sons Theodebert (Salzburg), Grimoald (Freising), and Tassilo (Passau). But of the fortunes of the papal mission nothing is known, and in any case, this ecclesiastical organization was not carried out. In this period falls also the appearance of CORBINIAN, a Frankish preacher and monk, who died in Mais, near Meran. He is regarded as the first bishop of **Freising**. But as yet there were no episcopal dioceses in Bavaria, but only clerics holding episcopal ordination, which they had received at home or in Rome. They had power to consecrate churches and clerics, and lived with their companions in monastic fashion. Even Vivilo, ordained by Pope Gregory III. for Passau, seems to have been in the same case. Meanwhile Charles Martel had forced Bavaria into subjection.

3. Thuringia (the East Franks).

Sources: Vita KILLIANI in Mabillon, A.S. II. 991. HRABAN, *Martyrolog.* sub 8th July, ML. 110, c. 1155.

The great Thuringian kingdom, which included modern Thuringia with the districts northwards as far as the Harz, and Franconia as far as the Main, and even as far as near to the Danube, under King Hermannfried in 530 was subject to the Franks, Theuderic united it to the Frankish kingdom. Its first contact with Christianity was of the political sort. Hermannfried was married to the Ostro-Gothic princess Amalakerga, an Arian; Hermannfried's brother was the father of S. RADEGUNDIS, who became the wife of the Frankish Theuderic, but

¹ MGL. III. 451. Its authenticity, which has often been impugned, is maintained by Riezlet and Hauck.

afterwards entered the cloister. Missionary activity is indeed not to be observed during the century of the alliance of Thuringia with Austrasia, but the Frankish Christian elements made their way in of themselves. RADULF, whom King Dagobert installed as Duke, and who in 640 again delivered Thuringia from the Frank Sigebert III., was a Christian, as were also his successors.

Irish-Scottish emissaries of the faith also began an important work in Franconia. Würzburg tradition knows of the Hibernian monk, KYLLENE (Cilian), who, on account of his strict Christian requirements, was killed with his companions by a chief (*judex*) of the country named Gozbert. Under Pippin a foreign race of rulers again took the place of the native. He gave over the Thuringian dukedom to Theobald, who was succeeded by HEDENUS. Both were obliged to break by violence the opposition of the magnates. The opposition was intensified by the fact that the people adhered to the Irish-Scottish missionaries, while Hedenus, who intended to found a monastery in Hammelburg, was on terms of relationship with WILLIBRORD, who had been ordained in Rome. The condition of Thuringia in the beginning of the eighth century exhibits a very confused state of affairs, a pell-mell of heathen and Christian cults and priestly services, with degraded and ignorant priests, who baptize without asking for the creed, and use baptism as an instrument of magic. The Irish-Scottish missionaries, with all the fidelity of individuals, seem to have been without mutual feeling and capacity of organization. In this way individual communities were formed, but not a provincial church; they did not succeed in educating a native clergy, and no help was afforded by the Frankish Church.

4. The Mission among the Frisians.

Sources: BEDE, H.E., especially the 5th Bk. Of the lives of the saints, that of AMANDUS in Mabillon A.S. II. 678, of ELIGIUS by his contemporary AUDOEN (D'Achery, *Spicil.* II.), of WILFRID by his pupil Stephanus (Mab. A.S. II.), of WILLIBRORD by ALCUIN (Jaffé, Br. G. VI. 394), of GREGORY by Liudger, Mab. A.S. III., also MI. 99, 7 sqq.), of LIUDGER by ALTRID, of LEBUIN by HUCBALD (but cf. Hauck II. 316), of WILLEHAD by Anskar (the three last named in MGS. II.). *Literature:* K. OBSER, *Wilfr. d. A.* Carlsruhe 1884. ALBERDINGK-THYM, *Der h. Willibrord*, Münster 1863 (of a Romish tinge). RICHTHOFEN, *Untersuchungen über friesische Rechtsgeschichte*, II. 1882.

This mission also is qualified in its results through its relation to the Frankish kingdom. In the beginning of the seventh century the Frisians extended from northern Flanders (still somewhat south of the mouth of the west Scheldt) beyond the modern Netherlands, East Friesland and Oldenburg, as far as the Weser, and farther even, were settled on the islands of the North Sea and the west coast of Schleswig. From the time of Dagobert I. of Austrasia (in 622) the wars of the Franks with the Frisians began. Dagobert must have come as far

as **Utrecht**, where he founded a chapel, which he made over to Bishop Cimbirt of Cologne; but from this point no considerable missionary activity seems to have proceeded. But even earlier began the activity of S. **AMANDUS**, who, after the life of an anchorite, believed himself to have been called in Rome by Peter, the Prince of the Apostles himself, to the preaching of the Gospel. Clotaire II. caused him to be consecrated bishop, and to work on the frontier where Franks and Frisians were in contact, and where the conversion of the Franks was by no means completed. The central point of his activity was **Ghent**. His preaching, however, found so much the stronger opposition, when he and the Bishop of Vermandois, with the support of the royal command, made baptism compulsory. After a likewise unsuccessful attempt to convert the Slavs on the Danube (Carinthia), he founded two Benedictine monasteries in Ghent; then, after he had fallen for a short time out of favour with Dagobert, he worked further south, especially by founding monasteries, and in 647 became Bishop of Maastricht (the later Liège), where his zealous efforts to reform the clergy, and to overcome the still firmly fixed heathenism, had likewise little success. He therefore resigned his episcopal office, in spite of the monition of Pope Martin, and attempted to work among the free Frisians at the mouth of the Scheldt; but here also, as subsequently among the Basques, in vain. Soon thereafter **ELIGIUS** had more success, a remarkable man of Aquitanian-Roman descent, who practised the art of the goldsmith, and thereby arrived at the Neustrian Court and won the favour of King Clotaire, and then of Dagobert, when the latter, after Clotaire's death, succeeded in Neustria also (628). Under the lively influence of the ascetic tendency newly kindled in the Frankish kingdom by Columba, he applied a large fortune won by his artistic skill to unlimited benevolence, founded numerous monasteries and furnished churches and the burial places of saints with artistic adornment. But he also used his influence over Dagobert in ecclesiastical affairs. After Dagobert's death, the Mayor of the Palace Herchenoald,¹ made him the successor of Bishop Aichar of Vermandois. Eligius took up his residence in Noyon, where he zealously applied himself to his ecclesiastical duties, especially to preaching, had his own troubles with the tenacious heathen life of the baptized Franks, and also conducted mission-work among the neighbouring Frisians. In the Frankish Church, along with his like-minded friend **AUDOEN**, Bishop of Rouens, he had continued to exercise an important influence.

At the time after Dagobert's death the weakness of the Frankish kingdom also brought about the retreat of its Frisian frontier, and thereby the extinction of the attempts at Christianization which had been there begun.

The efforts of the faith now proceeded from another side. **LIVINUS**, a pupil of the monk Augustine, is already said to have conducted missionary work in Friesland. So likewise the Anglo-Saxon Abbot and Bishop **WILFRID** (p. 52) found friendly reception with the Frisian King **ALDGILD** (677). The Neustrian Mayor of the Palace, Ebroin, at the instigation of Wilfrid's opponents at home, in vain demanded his surrender. But the favourable impression which Wilfrid left behind him was only transitory. Aldgild's successor, **RADBOD** (from 679 to 719), gave up the hitherto existing

¹ As it seems, in order to send him to a distance from the court.

friendly relation to Austrasia, at first attached himself successfully to Neustria, but thereby fell into conflict with the family of Pippin. So long as Pippin of Heristal was kept busy with Neustria, Radbod, as it appears, succeeded in regaining the district conquered from the Franks. But after the battle at Testri (in 687), whereby Pippin gained the mayoralty of the palace over the whole Frankish kingdom, the latter by the victory at Dorstadt brought Friesland as far as the old Rhine into his hands, and forced Radbod to enter into negotiations for peace.

The Anglo-Saxon EGBERT, like other Anglo-Saxons, had been trained in the monastic life and in Christian philosophy in an Irish monastery, and in sickness had made a vow to live as a stranger. After a twenty years' residence in Ireland he formed the conception of the mission to Friesland, but being hindered in his intention, at first caused his pupil WICBERT to go thither; he, however, returned after two years without accomplishing anything (about 688). Now, however, WILLIBRORD appeared, the son of the pious Wilgil, who finally, as a hermit at the mouth of the Humber, built an oratory to S. Andrew, and expanded it into a monastery. Willibrord was educated in the monastery of Ripon, north-west of York, which was originally filled with Irish-Scottish monks, but in 664 had come under the guidance of Wilfrid, whose opinions were those of Rome, till some years thereafter the latter entered upon the bishopric of York. Willibrord,¹ however, as a youth of twenty, went to Ireland in 678 and remained there for twelve years. Egbert then sent him with twelve companions to Friesland. But the war between the Franks and the Frisians had increased Radbod's disinclination towards the Frankish religion. Willibrord betook himself to Pippin, who favoured his undertaking, then to the Pope in Rome, with the view of working under commission from him. The successes among the Frisians now induced the Anglo-Saxon priests to choose a bishop from among themselves, without connection with the Frankish Church. They did not, however, choose Willibrord, but SUDBERT, who was consecrated in England, and indeed by Wilfrid. But the new bishop immediately left Friesland, and betook himself to the Bructerii (*vid. inf.*). The conjecture is obvious, that Pippin's intention of keeping the Frisian mission in his own hand, had been influential in bringing this about. As a matter of fact Willibrord and his friends appear to have convinced themselves, that ecclesiastical regulations in the Frankish kingdom could only be made with the co-operation of the power of the state. Pippin now availed himself of the greater expan-

¹ Induced by Egbert's invitation.

sion of the Frankish dominion over Friesland which had been won (as far as the Flevum). He again sent Willibrord to Rome, where Bishop Sergius, on November 22, 696, consecrated him Archbishop of the Frisians, under the name of CLEMENT. The mission among the Frisians now made rapid advances, the education of a native clergy began, and ecclesiastical foundations afforded fixed points of support. On the other hand, Willibrord's exertions among the free Frisians had little success in presence of Radbod's repellent attitude, so likewise his excursions farther north, as far as the Danes, from among whom he brought back Danish boys to be educated as Christians. Being driven upon Heligoland on his way back, he preached there, and ventured to baptize converts with water from a well held sacred by the Frisians. For this reason he was sent a prisoner to Radbod, but set at liberty by him on the decision of the lot, and was allowed to return to Utrecht. The long-suppressed animosity of the Frisians against the Franks then came to an outburst, in the murder of Pippin's son Grimoald (Radbod's son-in-law). Soon thereafter Pippin died, and in the internal war between Neustria and Austria, Radbod took the side of the former, and thereby at first obtained again his ancestral possessions. The destruction of the flourishing Christian foundations was the result. The conquest of Radbod by CHARLES MARTEL, in 718, which was soon followed by Radbod's death (719), first restored to the Franks the possession of Friesland as far as the Zuydersee; subsequently, after the death of the Frisian prince POPPO, in 738, northern Friesland was also partly won, partly it at least came under Frankish influence. Immediately after Radbod's death, WILLIBRORD went again to Utrecht, where Boniface (*vid. infra*) co-operated with him from 719 till 722. After the victory of 734, the complete establishment of the long planned **Bishopric of Utrecht** was accomplished. The later appearance of Boniface in Friesland, and his death in the neighbourhood of Dokkum, show, even after the middle of the century, the entire power of heathenism in this district. In spite of the archiepiscopal title, Willibrord, for the rest, was to the end in actual fact only simple Bishop of Utrecht. He died in 739, and found his resting-place in the monastery of Echternach on the Moselle, which had been presented to him by Pippin.

Among the continuators of his work in Friesland, the first place is taken by GREGORY, a Frank of noble Frankish¹ family, who, as pupil and faithful adherent of Boniface, came to Utrecht shortly

¹ But not Merovingian, *vid.* Hauck, II. 312.

² Against the reasons given by Rettberg. *vid.* Hauck, II. 314, I. 542.

before the latter's death. He presided as abbot and presbyter over the important **school** of the monastery of S. Martin, and although he did not receive the episcopal dignity,² practically led the Frisian Church. He caused Alberct, an Anglo-Saxon, who held episcopal consecration, to fulfil the episcopal functions. Gregory's work is the Christianization of the part of Friesland between the Flevum (Zuydersee) and the Lauwersee. After his death (*ca.* 775-780) his nephew Alberich, who received episcopal consecration from Cologne, succeeded. Among the assistants of Gregory were LEBUIN, who worked on the Yssel, and founded the church at Deventer, and WILLEHAD, who pressed still further east, and was then called by Charlemagne to the Saxons, and made Bishop of Bremen. From that centre he was also active in promoting the mission to the Frisians between the Ems and the Weser. After the Saxon insurrection under Widukind had also wrought detrimentally upon the Frisian mission, LIUDGER, a Frisian by birth, who had previously been active in Deventer, again took up the work, effected the conversion of the Frisians as far as the Ems, and then became bishop in Münster. These circumstances explain the fact that Münster retained the Frisian district between the Lauwersee and the Ems, although it was quite separated from its Saxon (Westphalian) diocese.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

The internal development of the Frankish Church down to the appearance of Boniface.

Sources : *Capitularia regum Franc.* ed. Boretius (MGL. sect. II.) Hann. 1883.—
 Literature : ARNDT, *Annalen d. fr. Reiche* (p. 56), *Die Jahrb. des frankischen Reichs unter Karl Martell* by Th. BREYSIG, those under Pippin by H. JAHN and OELSNER. LOENING, *Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenrechts*, 2 vols. 1878 sq.

THE history of the Frisian mission, in the case of Willibrord, and still more, subsequently, in that of Boniface, comes into contact with their ministry for Germany. The latter, however, is at the same time conditioned by the ecclesiastical circumstances of the Frankish kingdom, in the form which they had taken since the conversion of Clovis. The remains of heathenism, against which Clovis had by no means proceeded with violence, disappeared very slowly. Under his successor, Theuderic I., the heathen cult shows itself on the Rhine, at Cologne, alongside of the Christian. The ascetic hermit WULFLAICH works in the midst of a heathen populace. Under Theuderic the army seems still to have offered human sacrifices in the Gothic war. Frankish synods of the sixth century repeatedly take measures against heathen customs and apostasy to heathenism. The *Præceptum Childeberti*¹ († 558) threatens landowners who will not abolish idols with punishment. Under Clovis's grandchildren heathenism seems to have disappeared in **Neustria**, apart from the frontier districts. It continued longer in Austria; heathens were still not unheard of at the court of Dagobert I.

1. If at the time of the dissolution of the Roman Empire in Gaul, the bishops had almost become the lords and guardians of the cities, they also now appear, belonging as they did to old and rich Roman families, and after possessing one and the same bishopric through several generations, as the born representatives of the Roman populace as against their German masters, and at the same time as the possessors of Roman civilization and the servants of the newly-accepted God and his saints, who were the dispensers of the divine graces. Church property quickly began to increase; to the bequests

¹ *Cap. reg. Franc.* I. 2 sqq.

of rich bishops were added the gifts of the princes, in which Clovis and his wife already led the way, and, among his sons, Childebert was specially distinguished. Clovis's grandson Chilperic already complained that all wealth had come into the Church. Private gifts and the tithe demanded by the clergy increased the prosperity, and the Church knew how to keep it together. Along with great property in land, the number of slaves and bondsmen of the Church increased, as well as of those who had been freed with the help of the Church, and who, with their descendants, remained in a certain relationship of dependence on the Church, and of those freemen to whom Church property was entrusted for their lifetime, or who conversely had made over their property to the Church, while retaining the usufruct during their own lives.

The bishops, being thus favoured, fell into a position of great dependence on the German crown. The nomination of bishops by the will of the king began to interfere with the old ecclesiastical canonical election of bishops, which several synods in the first half of the sixth century still sought to maintain.

Even a bishop elected in canonical fashion only obtains possession of his dignity by royal decree, and benefices bestowed by the king require the investiture of the bishops by the king.¹ The clergy are also subject to secular penal jurisdiction, and no civil jurisdiction, even over the clergy, is recognised as belonging to the Church. As little are the Church's people exempted from liability to military service. Although the Roman Church, as an institution, as in all these German kingdoms, lives according to Roman law, the persons of the clergy do not, but rather stand under the law of the tribe in which they were born.² Further, the power of summoning councils of the kingdom was with the King. The tendency to allow ecclesiastical affairs to be modified in the interest of the kingdom, comes out in the endeavour, to make the limits of episcopal dioceses, and especially of the metropolitan see, coincide with the limits of the kingdom, and so to detach subjects of the Frankish kingdom from foreign ecclesiastical alliance.

On the other hand, **internal**, properly **ecclesiastical**, questions are pretty much left to the independent power of the bishops. The national councils are indeed summoned by the king, but he neither claims the presidency nor the right of confirming their decisions. Kings and secular magnates are indeed (in the seventh century) frequently present, but have no vote. The councils remain purely spiritual assemblies (no *concilia mixta*), but ecclesiastical legislation is essentially non-obligatory even for the domain of the state. Thus,

¹ *Vid.* the Capitulary of Clotaire II. of the year 614.

² *Vid.* Loening, ii. 284 sqq. At first this could not be so evident, the clergy being almost entirely Roman.

heresy, *e.g.*, however denounced by the Church, does not appear as a crime from the point of view of the state. Of course a certain supervision is conceded to the bishops in judicial affairs, especially in judicial transactions in matters pertaining to freedmen and vassals of the Church.

On the other hand, the wealth and landed property of **bishops** make them important **members of the political commonwealth**, who have to share in decisions on secular affairs at the assemblies of the realm. The wealth of the clergy excites the envy of the nobles, who, on the now approaching decay of the kingdom through numerous partitions and with the fall of the Merovingian family, seek to gain possession of the Church's property. **Frankish families** begin to enter the clergy in great numbers, and at most screen their habits of life, their unruliness and barbarism, by external observance of the precepts of the Church.

2. The comparatively easy acceptance of Christianity by the Franks, and the speedy amalgamation of Frankish with Gallo-Roman life is to be regarded on the one hand as a victory of the superior Gallo-Roman civilization, but on the other hand it is a result of the preponderance of Germanic vigour over the aged Roman culture.

Gregory of Tours' Frankish History unveils to us a picture of violence and crime, a moral condition, in which lawlessness, greed of enjoyment and treachery are everywhere prominent, but of the ties of Christian training little is to be observed. At the same time the acceptance of Christianity has filled the nation with a certain awe of the revealed God and a certain pride in the heavenly King, the Frank-loving Christ, a belief in God and Providence which is ready to see miracles everywhere, and a devotion to favourite saints; on the other hand, a deep sense of human nothingness and transitoriness and an impression of the value of the future world, begin to rule men's minds; the need of the forgiveness of sins and the conviction that it is to be gained by renunciation of the world, stand immediately alongside of the most lawless passion and self-seeking. In these wild times there is, on the whole, failure of all serious vindication of Church-discipline. But the advancing habituation of the people to the Church, to church attendance, to the celebration of the feasts of saints and to pilgrimages, nevertheless exercises an educative influence. Ecclesiastical buildings become more numerous; the keeping of Sunday is required. The division of the bishoprics into parishes becomes of importance for the rural population.—At the same time a great increase of **monasteries** takes place, the founding of which is looked upon as a work well pleasing to God. The holy lives of the monks seem to supply what is lacking in secular Christianity; they are regarded as the intercessors for the sins of the rest of men.

3. In the **regulation of monastic life**, down to the end of the sixth century, the older authorities (*vid.* i. 374 sqq.), Cæsarius and Aurelian of Arles, the Rules of Basil the Great and Pachomius, the writings of Cassian and the monastic life of Lerinum, served as

examples, but as yet there was no definite, dominant rule; that of Benedict had as yet won no influence, and the different monasteries stood in no closer alliance. The savagery of the age had decivilized the monasteries also; even Lerinum, once so highly esteemed, had fallen a victim to its influence since 537, under Frankish rule.

With COLUMBA a **new reforming element** now made its appearance for the Frankish monastic life. Numerous monastic foundations were established by men of his school; in the monastery of Luxeuil under Columba's successors Eustasius and Waldebert, educated monks appeared and became abbots of different monasteries. Alongside of the fame of **Luxeuil** that of **Lerinum** paled. Older monasteries were reformed on the model of Luxeuil, the abbot of which exercised his species of right of supervision over many very distant monasteries. But elsewhere also a powerful improvement of monastic life, since the seventh century, is visible *e.g.* in the Rhine district. Columba's own **Monastic Rule**¹ shows, in the moral precepts for the monks, a high religious idealism, but at the same time in the *regula cœnobialis* remarkably harsh and petty penal rules against every violation of the monastic life, reckoned on the principle, that monastic self-renunciation in unconditional, blind obedience to the abbot, should break the personal will, and should renounce **will** as well as **property**. In spite of the great impulse which proceeded from Columba, his Rule was soon obliged to retire before the growth of the **Benedictine Rule**, which, being moderate and aiming at the attainable, showed itself better adapted for the regulation of the organization and administration of monasteries than that of Columba, which properly only contains direction towards the ascetic life and penal regulations. The Rule of Benedict soon found acceptance as a necessary supplement in the Columban monasteries also.²

Columba and his Scottish monks, proceeding from their monastic church, under whose guidance stood the whole people which was won for Christianity, regarded not only their own perfection in ascetic Christianity, but also the guidance of the souls of the people, as their duty. It was above all the lack of serious church-discipline in the Frankish Church to which Columba took objection, and the hence proceeding attempt, **to place the laity under the discipline of**

¹ *Vid.* O. SEEBASS, *Col.'s Klosterregel u. Bussbuch*. Dresden 1883; Hauck, I. 247.

² Monastic records, which mention both Rules alongside one another, are by no means always rightly suspected of the later interpolation of Benedict's name.

confession, had a reforming influence and one of very great importance for the institutions of penance and confession in the Catholic Church. In the penitential which bears the name of Columba, Hauck (I. 254) thinks he can separate out the genuine core (cap. 13-37), which, in distinction from the monastic rule, is aimed not at monastic holiness, but at Christian decency applicable to the laity, and the conflict with tangible gross sins and crimes.

4. If towards the end of the sixth century many able bishops of Romance descent, of ecclesiastical disposition and learning, wrought in the Frankish Church, such as pre-eminently Gregory of Tours (*ob.* 595), invaluable on account of his History of the Franks, and the poet of Italian descent Venantius Fortunatus (*ob. post* 600, *vid.* i. 468), in the seventh century Roman culture and language declined very quickly, as is shown by a comparison of Gregory with Fredegar and the barbaric Latin of the book of forms of Marculf.

An important social transformation is at the same time completed, in the attainment by a number of families to princely wealth and great possessions in land with numerous vassals, while on the other hand many born free-men sank into dependence on magnates or the Church, and the freeholders of small properties more and more disappeared. The king no longer stands over against the people, but against the magnates. The conflict of these magnates for power, is in many ways allied with the struggle of different tribes for independence or predominance. From the time of Dagobert (622) the power of the Majordomus emerges with increasing decision, and in the conflicts of the different parts of the land with each other, the bishops, who are often very political or military in character, are involved, the Church having become the largest landowner. The bishops whose spiritual authority is of service to them over and above, appear as a spiritual aristocracy alongside of the secular, and interfere rigorously in public affairs. Alongside of Pippin the Elder (of Landen), stands *e.g.* ARNULF of Metz (the ancestor of the Carolingian house) as the guide of King Dagobert. Later on, Bishop LEODEGAR of Autun in Burgundy appeared as party-chief at the head of the Burgundian and Austrasian magnates against the power of the Neustrian Majordomus EBROIN, who ruled for Theoderic III., till the latter was made a monk. The bishop was for a long time Majordomus of Burgundy, till he was taken prisoner by Childeric III., along with his opponent Ebroin. Subsequently the two were again in conflict: Ebroin conquered Autun, Leodegar was found guilty of the death of Childeric and cruelly executed (678). In this Ebroin was no foe to the Church, but only a ruthless opponent of Leodegar's political power, and the latter, immediately after his death, received the honour of a martyr.

The period of these internal conflicts, from the death of Dagobert, was bound to work disastrously in relation to the Church. The frequent abuse of so-called **simony** emerges to a great extent. Ecclesiastical posts are regularly given by the holders of power to their frequently very violent partizans. The bishops reached out their hands after the rich monasteries, the latter themselves are

once more decivilized. Synods rather serve political purposes than the general affairs of the Church. Bishops regard their office as private property, and themselves appoint their successors. The livings of several parishes are, by the favour of their patrons, made over to one person, and we also find laymen as the holders of parishes. Bishops and abbots return to the secular life, or as clergymen live an entirely secular life, addicted to arms, sport, and free love. Under these circumstances the rich Church begins to get poor, since every one reaches out his hand after the property of the Church, the bishops themselves not excluded.

5. Even from the time of the powerful rule of Pippin of Heristal these circumstances are little altered. Pippin was a good churchman, did not allow ecclesiastical foundations to be lacking, promoted ecclesiastical enterprises, such as that of Willibrord in Friesland; but at the same time his point of view in all this was predominantly secular. He regarded the spiritual magnates as important factors in the interest of the kingdom, and allowed bishoprics to become the domains of great families, and even secular dominions, which were, as it were, hereditary in the family. His powerful successor CHARLES MARTEL looked at the matter in the same light, but interfered more frequently and deeply in ecclesiastical affairs. Political considerations caused him to proceed mercilessly against many bishops, and to fill up bishoprics and abbacies with his adherents, without regard to their ecclesiastical worthiness. Bishop Milo of Trèves (the son of Liutwin, of Trèves) he made at the same time Bishop of Rheims. The metropolitan alliance began to dissolve, bishoprics remained vacant, and to a very great extent claims were made on the property of the Church for political purposes. The usufruct of whole abbacies and even bishoprics was presented to meritorious generals, who then received the tonsure, but otherwise lived in wedlock and amid their military and secular concerns; ecclesiastical discipline fell into decay. Boniface then complained that for more than eighty years no Frankish synod had been held, which certainly is not quite literally true.

6. At the same time, this Frankish Church stood over against the **Bishop of Rome** as an entirely independent national Church. In Roman Gaul, the supreme authority of the Bishop of Rome had been effectuated since the time of Leo the Great (*vid. i. p. 344 sqq.*), and the Catholic Church both in the Gothic and the Burgundian kingdom had strictly adhered to it. In the beginning of the sixth century Cæsarius of Arles was the champion of this way of thinking in Southern Gaul; in 514 Pope Symmachus made him Papal Vicar,

and his successors exercised their authority and ecclesiastical power in regulations as to discipline and doctrine and in appointments to bishoprics. After South-eastern Gaul had fallen to the Frankish kingdom, the Bishops of Rome sought through the bishops of Arles as their vicars, to gain a regular influence on the hitherto quite untouched Merovingian kingdom. Here, indeed, the successor of the Prince of the Apostles, the guardian of ecclesiastical tradition and the unity of the faith, was looked upon with reverence, but the practical power of the Frankish kings in ecclesiastical affairs did not permit of any real exercise of Roman ecclesiastical power.

Gregory the Great stood on friendly terms with the Frankish Church, his advice was sought, and he incessantly exerted himself, in written intercourse with Brunhilde and individual bishops of the Frankish kingdom, to lend help to the affairs of the Church according to Roman views, but without essential success. He does not appear here as the supreme bearer of ecclesiastical power, even though the bestowal of the pallium on highly esteemed bishops, and the granting of monastic privileges still originated from him. The Bishop of Arles is at first appointed Vicar of the Bishop of Rome after the approval of the king. But Vigilius of Arles, who was appointed by Gregory the Great, was the last who really bore this office.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

Boniface.

Sources: Chief source: The letters of Boniface in the Opp. ed. Giles, 1842, Ml. 89, and by Würdtwein, Mainz 1789, best, however, in Jaffé, BrG. III. (Mon. Mog.). On the chronology of the letters many dissertations by Jaffé, Dünzelmann, Hahn and Oelsner, *vid.* LOOFS, *Zur Chronologie*, etc., Lpz. 1881 (Dissert.). The *Vitæ of Boniface* by WILLIBALD about 760, that of the UTRECHT ANONYMUS (c. 790) and the considerably more recent one by OTHLO in MGS. II., Ml. 89, Jaffé BrG. I. c. Willibald's life of St. Boniface, translated by ARNDT, 1863, and by SIMSON, Berlin 1863.—The monographs of SEITERS, MÜLLER, Amsterdam 1869, A. WERNER 1875, BUSS, ed. by R. von Scherer, Tübingen 1880. D. Fischer 1881, and EBRARD's *Tendenzschrift: Bonif. der Zerstörer des columb. Kirchenthums*, Gütersloh 1882. Special note is still deserved by Rettberg (I. 304) and now by HAUCK; H. HAHN, *Bon. u. Lull.*, Lpz. 1883, *Jahrb. d. fränk. Reichs*, *vid.* p.65.

BONIFATIUS (not Bonifacius¹) is the Latin name of the Anglo-Saxon Winfrid, who was born at Crediton, near Exeter, in Wessex, before 680 (perhaps as early as 672–675). He received a monastic education in the otherwise unknown monastery of Adescancaster, which is rediscovered in the modern Exeter, on the frontier where British and Saxon life were in contact. He is next found in the monastery of Nutsall, between Winchester and Southampton, as the pupil of the revered Abbot Winbercht, and then as teacher in the monastic school there. He gave up a promising ecclesiastical career at home in order to serve Christ abroad, in the effort after monastic perfection. After a vain attempt in Friesland in 716, where Willibrord's activity was interrupted by war, he betook himself in 718, on the recommendation of Bishop Daniel of Winchester, through the Frankish kingdom, to Pope Gregory II. at Rome, with the purpose of placing himself at his service for the spread of the faith. Here he acquired familiarity with the Romish ritual and views of ecclesiastical law, and was sent by Gregory (installation on the 15th May, 719) to the wild peoples of Germany, "if by any means the desert field of their hearts might receive the plough of the Gospel." In baptism he was to make use of the Roman form, as Abbot Augustine had once also required of the British clergy. He aimed directly

¹ *Vid.* WILL in JGG. I. 1880. Hauck I. 402.

at Thuringia, where Duke Hedenus, who died at that time, had already had relations with Willibrord, while at the same time the alliance between Rome and Bavaria was formed (*vid.* p. 61).

The **Thuringian** Church was intended, as it seems, to form the connecting link between the Bavarian and the Frisian. On his way Bonifatius visited the Lombard king Luitprand, and went from Pavia, avoiding Alamannia, over the Brenner to Bavaria, and thence through South Thuringia (Franconia, neighbourhood of Würzburg). Rome regarded this country as already Christian, but Boniface was to appear as a reformer with full power from the Pope, to abolish the powerful remains of heathenism, to combat the views and arrangements of the Celtic preachers which were repudiated by Rome, and in general bring the clergy into submission to the canonical precepts of Rome. After slight success he betook himself to the kingdom of the Franks, perhaps even then in order to obtain the help of Charles Martel for the intended re-organization of the Church, and, on the news of Radbod's death, to Friesland to Willibrord, with whom he worked for three years.

After his return in 722 he preached in the neighbourhood of the **Lahn**, where heathenism still greatly predominated, then on the **Frankish Saale** and in **Hesse**, now with great success. On his communications and questions addressed to the Pope he was summoned by Gregory to Rome in the end of 722, and there, on the basis of a confession of faith and an oath of homage rendered to the Pope, he was consecrated **Reginary Bishop** of Germany. This oath is formed after the model of that which the Roman suburbicary bishops had to take, only the promise of loyalty against the Greek Emperor is naturally wanting; on the other hand, it promises to hold no communion with bishops who reject the direction of the Church. (This was aimed at Frankish bishops also, who, not less than the Irish priests, violated the law of the Church.) **Strict carrying out of the Roman principles of ecclesiastical order, and so far also, organic attachment to Rome, becomes his aim, energetically and ruthlessly pursued.** Recommended by the Pope to Charles Martel, he comes with his safe conduct and a papal letter to the chiefs and people, to Hesse and Thuringia, and there (from 724) develops a most comprehensive, combative and successful ministry, reaching as far as the Saxon frontier. Numerous Anglo-Saxon monks and nuns were attracted by him. The monasteries of Ohrdruff, Bischofsheim (Lioba), and Fritzlar become fixed centres. In Thuringia in particular the conflict was enkindled with the pre-Roman Christianity of the Scottish and Frankish sort, which in its

isolation was often very rude, and strongly admixed with heathen superstition. But indeed these married priests are all to him *fornicatores*, their variant doctrines and institutions of the Irish-Scottish sort make them preachers of lies and seducers of the people. To their loose combination and often disorderly life he opposes strict Roman discipline and strenuous opposition to the marriage of priests, and all apparently heathen customs. As a matter of fact, these priests must often have most crassly intermingled heathen and Christian elements. Bonifatius seems to have received little support from Charles Martel, which is easily explained by his harsh attitude towards the Frankish bishops. Pope Gregory himself exhorts him not entirely to break off intercourse with "sinful" bishops.

When Boniface declared that he was no longer able to cope with the immense growth of Christian flocks, the Pope in 732 created him an **archbishop** who should appoint bishops in Germany. Boniface worked at first in **Bavaria**, where Duke Hucbert now again recognised the Frankish supremacy, preached, visited churches, and deposed a certain schismatical Eremwulf. Christianity, diffused by numerous ecclesiastical foundations and individual priests (including Scottish), was above all to be drawn into the united organism of the Church, and subjected to obedience to Rome. Success was at first small; but from Bavaria he brought with him the youth Sturm, whom he had educated in the monastic school at Fritzlar. After Boniface's **third journey to Rome**, in 738, Gregory (Ep. 37), required the bishops in **Bavaria** and **Alamannia** to hold synods under Boniface's presidency for the restoration of ecclesiastical order, and (Ep. 36) **Thuringia** and **Hesse** to be obedient to the bishops instituted by Boniface. The most important points are the restoration of canonical order in contrast to the hitherto loose state of affairs, and fixed episcopal constitution in contrast to the position hitherto of the so-called abbot-bishops, which arose out of the missionary activity of the monasteries; further, Roman consecration of bishops, the celibacy of priests and the carrying out of the Benedictine Rule for the monks. The projected Alamannian-Bavarian synods, however, were not attained; rather there first ensued the ordering of the **Bavarian Church** under Duke **ODILO** (the Agilolfing). **VIVILIO** was recognised as Bishop of **Passau**; but, for the bishopric erected in **Ratisbon**, not Wicterp, who already possessed episcopal consecration, but a certain **GAUBALD** was installed, who at the same time became the head of the monastery of S. Emmeran. **Salzburg** received **JOHN**; a fourth bishopric was erected in **Freising** and bestowed upon **ERIMBERT** the brother of Corbinian; the dioceses were

marked out with the approval of Odilo and the magnates of the country. Originating from Reichenau there followed the foundation of the monastery of Altaich in the diocese of Passau, and of Benedictbeuern in the Bavarian portion of the bishopric of Augsburg. The time now arrived for the erection of bishoprics for Franconia, Thuringia and Hesse. **Würzburg** was to be the episcopal seat for Frankish South Thuringia, **Eichstädt** on the Altmühl for the so-called Nordgau, **Büraburg** (Bürberg, between Fritzlar and Amöneberg) for Hesse, and **Erfurt** for Northern Thuringia. As a matter of fact a bishop must also have been appointed for Erfurt, and the diocese must have been marked out. It seems only (like Büraburg) not to have been filled up again after the death of the first occupant of the see. The ordination of the three bishops of Würzburg, Büraburg and Erfurt took place in the summer of 741 (papal confirmation not till 743).

At this time, almost contemporaneously with Pope Gregory III. and the Greek Emperor Leo the Isaurian, there died also the most powerful man of the West, CHARLES MARTEL (20th October, 741). CARLMANN succeeded in the German-speaking Frankish kingdom (Austrasia), with Alamannia and Thuringia (Bavaria under Odilo was regarded as independent), PIPPIN in Neustria. The former seconded the ecclesiastical plans of Boniface, and lent a hand in the reformation of the Austrasian Church according to Roman order. At his instigation, willingly adopted by Boniface, there ensued (where, is not known) the famous **Concilium Germanicum Primum** (April, 742).¹ With it begins the action of Boniface on the **Frankish**, at first the **Austrasian Church**. "We Carlmann, Duke and Prince of the Franks, have in the year 743 after the incarnation of our Lord, on the 21st April, on the advice of the servants of God, assembled the bishops of our kingdom along with the priests to a synod, namely, the Archbishop Boniface, the bishops Burchard (Würzburg), Raginfrid (Cologne), Wintan (Wita, Büraburg), Witbald (Willibald of Eichstädt), Dadan (according to Hauck's relative conjecture, Bishop of Erfurt, not Utrecht), Edda (Strassburg), in order to receive their counsel as to how the law of God and the discipline of the Church, which almost entirely decayed in the days of the previous princes, may be restored and the Christian people led to the salvation of their souls, and not go to destruction, deceived by false priests. 1. Hence, on the advice of the priests and magnates, we have appointed bishops in the cities and set Boniface the ambassador of S. Peter over them as Archbishop." Synods are to

¹ According to others, not till 743.

be held annually, in order that in the presence of Carlmann the regulations of spiritual law may be restored and the Christian religion purified. "We give back the properties which have been withdrawn from the Church. But from false priests and dissolute deacons and clergy we withdraw the ecclesiastical revenues, depose them, and force them to repentance."

The further points refer to :—

2. Prohibition of the bearing of arms, military service and hunting, to the clergy; 3. An annual account of his conduct of office which every priest is to render to the bishop; 4. Deposition of foreign and unknown bishops and priests by the synods; 5. Procedure by the bishops, supported by the courts, against heathen customs; 6. Penalties against clergy, monks and nuns, who fall into carnal sin; against secular clothing, and harbouring of women by the clergy; introduction of the Benedictine rule in the monasteries.

But great hindrances to the carrying out of these reforms were offered by the condition hitherto of the Frankish clergy. Warlike secular bishops, like Gewilip of Mayence, and Milo of Trèves—men with whom Carlmann could not dispense—formed the natural chiefs of a party which everywhere opposed Boniface and crossed all his steps at court, a much more dangerous opposition than the isolated Scottish apostles. As a matter of fact, in consequence of this synod, operations were begun for the filling up of a number of vacant Austrasian bishoprics. On the other hand, assent to the restoration of Church property proved itself to be impracticable in view of the military problems of the time. The Synod of *Liptinæ*, *Liftinæ* (Lestines, crown domains in the Hennegau, near Binche) was held in 743 as a second Austrasian synod, in accordance with the decisions of the *Concilium German pr.* as to annual synods, altered that decision to the extent, that ecclesiastical prebends might be left in lay hands as so-called *precaria* (*sub precaria et censu*), so long as one solidus from every *Manse* was given to the Church. After the death of the individual thus invested by the Church, the property falls back to the Church, but may again be bestowed on a layman, provided that thereby churches and monasteries are not too greatly impoverished!¹

¹ This presentation returns with Hauck to the older conception, that the assembly of Lestines—which moreover was not purely spiritual, but a mixed one composed of spiritual and secular elements—is to be assigned to the year 743 as a second Austrasian synod, while in consequence of the recent numerous treatises on the chronology of the letters of Boniface, the variant opinions had gained great credence, that the assembly of Lestines was identical with that of 745, at which Bishop Gewilip of Mayence was deposed, and accordingly was not

Now, however, Boniface's reforming activity began to extend to **Neustria** also, where Pippin applied himself with decision to the problems of the Church, and availed himself of the counsel and support of Boniface. The first main object was the restoration of the regular metropolitan alliance. Pippin appointed (743), and Boniface ordained, the Scottish monk **ABEL**, from the monastery of Laubach, to be Archbishop of **Rheims**, to **Rouen** Abbot **GRIMO** of Corbie, to **Sens** **HARTBERT**. Pope Zacharias was besought to confer the pallia, and granted them, at the same time treating this as the confirmation of the bishops. But during the embassy to the Pope, Pippin altered his view, and now begged for the pallium only for *one* bishop (Grimo), much to the astonishment of the Pope. As at the same time Boniface was reproaching the Pope with simony on account of the demand for money for the pallium, Pippin's change of mind has been connected with this fact; but whatever the reason was, the affair shows how independently Pippin proceeded even in relation to the Pope. In 744 (2nd March) the Neustrian Synod assembled at **Soissons**,¹ in which twenty-three bishops took part, along with the secular magnates.² The synod expressly declared in favour of the acceptance of the dogma and ecclesiastical law of the whole Church. The decisions as to metropolitans, legitimate bishops, synods and discipline followed the first Austrasian Council, those on the appropriation of Church property and the prohibition of marriage followed the decisions of Lestines. Of special difficulty was the reform of the clergy, among whom the most equivocal persons had found employment: escaped slaves, who had received the tonsure, men of no education whatever, who performed ecclesiastical functions in a frivolous fashion, some who played the priest without having been ordained, and often enjoyed the attachment of communities while leading an objectionable life.

Finally, a **general Frankish Synod** was arrived at in 745, to the holding of which Carlmann and Pippin were both induced by Boniface.³ Here ensued the deposition of Bishop **GEWILIP** of Mayence. His father and predecessor **GEROLD** had taken part in the old Frankish fashion in the war against the Saxons, and there met his

to be regarded as an Austrasian synod, but as a General Council common to all Franks.

¹ *Vid.* Pippin's capitulum in *Mg. Capit. Reg. Fr.* I. i. 28 sqq.

² Aquitaine, which had taken a very independent attitude under Duke Waifar, and for which Pippin did not contemplate an archbishop, does not seem to be represented.

³ *Vid.* the letter of the Pope to Boniface in *Bon. Epp. Ep.* 51.

death. Carlmann conferred the bishopric of the father on the son, and the son took revenge in the old fashion on the Saxons who had slain his father. For that reason, the vote of the church was now carried which required his deposition.

Measures were then taken here against two men who had already been the source of much trouble to Boniface, and whom we only know, indeed, from Boniface's one-sided account: the Frank ADALBERT and CLEMENT¹ the Scot. ADALBERT, an extraordinary favourite with the people as preacher, saint, and miracle-worker, who believed himself to be in special alliance with God, appealed to unknown relics of great healing power, which had come to him through an Englishman, and had been able to obtain episcopal consecration, and now preached to concourses of the people in the open air, at crosses, fountains, and other places, while the people, hanging upon the miraculous and exuberant preacher, neglected bishops and churches for that purpose. Without confession—because he already knew of their sins—he forgave the people. They had no need to make pilgrimage to the apostles' thresholds, since they could find with him what they sought there. Neither the depreciation of churches consecrated in the names of the saints proceeds from a point of view determined by principle, nor the forgiveness of sins without express confession, and the declaration of the superfluity of pilgrimages, but from the ecstatic immediate power, which, as it were, would fain give everything at first hand. A biography of Adalbert, which represented him as a saint of God chosen from his mother's womb, was current in the form of a letter from heaven said to have fallen in Jerusalem, which Adalbert was skilful enough to spread. He was neither an Irish-Scottish "Culdee" in Ebrard's sense, nor a representative of the national Frankish party and fundamental opponent on principle of Rome and Roman order,—for even according to his letter, Rome, the grave of the apostles, is the holy place, where the keys of the kingdom of heaven are deposited—but he was a religious enthusiast in the sense delineated. The second, CLEMENT, was a Scottish priest, who likewise possessed episcopal ordination, and with a fixed and limited see was active in Germany (Austrasia). He came forward in conscious opposition to Roman principles, such as the celibacy of the clergy—he himself living openly in wedlock—would not recognise the binding authority of the Fathers, taught concerning Christ's descent into hell, that by it all who were bound in hell, believers and unbelievers, worshippers

¹ Bonif. Ep. 50, p. 137, and Ep. 48, p. 132, and the Acts of the Roman Synod, p. 139.

of God and idolaters, were set free, and he had special ideas on predestination. Though in him the opposition of the Celtic priests to the new Roman Christianity is active, it was other things also—special theological conceptions, not Celtic peculiarities—which here came into the conflict.

As early as the summer of 743 Boniface had condemned both men as servants and precursors of Antichrist, and had them taken into custody (probably monastic), for which purpose Carlmann (in regard to Clement) and Pippin (for Adalbert) must have lent him their assistance. At Soissons also Adalbert's doctrines were condemned, and the crosses at which he had preached were burned. Both men, however, must soon have regained freedom, whether by the co-operation of popular currents, hostile to Boniface, or from the fact that the princes did not desire the application of forcible means contrary to the Frankish conceptions of law.

At the general Frankish Synod of 745, Bonifatius again pressed and obtained their condemnation. With the assent of the princes, they were stripped of their episcopal dignity, and anew condemned to imprisonment in a monastery; but there also they did not submit, and were soon again able to lead the people astray. Boniface then carried their condemnation at a Roman synod in 748, which proceeded against them solely on the information of their accuser. But even this sentence was without effective power, for they still gave trouble for years (Ep. Zachar., 5th Jan. 747).

Finally, at the General Council of 745, the business of the erection of an archiepiscopal metropolis for Boniface came under discussion. **Cologne** was in contemplation for the purpose, and the princes gave their promise on the subject. But they did not hold to it; Cologne received a new bishop, and Boniface had to resolve to take over the **Bishopric of Mayence** vacated by the deposition of Gewilip. This one, in spite of the **personal dignity** of Boniface as Archbishop and papal Vicar, remained a simple bishopric. The establishment of an Austrasian metropolis was postponed.¹

The Pope had always proceeded on the hypothesis, that Boniface's office should also continue after his death.² The princes now dropped the plan of an archbishopric of Cologne, and in doing so intimated that Boniface should have no successor in his position as

¹ The Bull of confirmation of Mayence as an Archbishopric, of the date 751—Ep. Bonif. 81, Jaffé 2292—is a recast in accordance with later tradition, of the charter issued by Zacharias for Cologne. Boniface's successor in Mayence did not become an archbishop, but a simple bishop. It is only after 780 that the Bishops of Mayence appear as archbishops.

² Cf. Bon. Ep. 59, p. 152.

archbishop. In Neustria also Pippin proceeded similarly. Abel, who had been raised to the archbishopric of Rheims, was unable to assert himself in this position. When Grimo of Rouen died, Reginfrid likewise did not receive the archiepiscopal dignity. This is explained by the fact that Pippin and Carlmann felt themselves to be sovereigns, and desired to keep ecclesiastical affairs in their own hands, without however thereby wishing to come into conflict with the authority of the Pope. In Bavaria also Boniface found opposition. The learned Celt, VIRGILIUS, recommended by Pippin to Duke Odilo for Salzburg, did indeed assume the headship of the bishopric of Salzburg, but had scruples in allowing himself to receive episcopal consecration, and allowed the episcopal functions to be performed by a regionary bishop. Boniface complained to the Pope about peculiar doctrines of Virgilius, which to him seemed heretical (doctrine of the antipodes). For the rest, Virgilius subsequently accepted episcopal ordination. In the year 747 Boniface held the **last synod** at which bishops from both parts of the kingdom were present. The decisions which ensued confirmed the reforms which had been begun, among which subjection to the Romish Church is expressly declared. But here, too, the carrying out of the metropolitan constitution remained a pious wish; as a matter of fact the prince exercised the greater part of the rights which Boniface desired to assign to the archbishop.

Of special importance for the work of Boniface are the numerous monastic foundations, as fixed settlements of Christianity and Christian civilization, which again became the starting-points of further mission work. Among them **Fulda** is eminent. Sturmi, a Bavarian educated in Fritzlar, caused his monks, as the neighbouring Hersfeld, which was at first contemplated, was too near to the hostile Saxons, to settle farther south on the Fulda, in the district of Grabfeld, on a site gifted to him by Carlmann and a few Frankish magnates. This became Fulda (742), the first abbot of which, Sturmi, ordered the life of the monks strictly according to Benedict's Rule, after he had visited Italian monasteries for his own information. At first the strictness of the rule was even surpassed on some points. Fulda remained Boniface's favourite foundation, where it was intended that his bones should one day rest. By a papal privilege of Zacharias (751) the monastery was placed under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome.¹ Among the numerous other

¹ On the *privilegium*, often attacked but recently defended by Th. Sickel, and since then pretty generally received as genuine, *vid.* Oelsner, *Jahrbücher d. fr. Reiches*, p. 58 sqq., and against Pflug-Hartlung's hypothesis of an interpolation, Hauck, I. 535 sq.

monastic foundations mention may further be made of **Bischofsheim** on the Tauber, which, under **LIOBA**, a relation of Boniface, became the most important seed-plot of female spiritual culture. In the year 752, Boniface, with the assent of the Pope, consecrated his pupil **LULLUS** to assist him, as bishop-suffragan, whom Pippin recognised as his representative, and made Bishop of Mayence. After Boniface once more, in a letter to the Abbot Fuldrat, had besought King Pippin to care for the clergy and monks who worked on the Saxon frontier for the gospel and suffered want, he took ship to Mayence with a numerous retinue of clergy and monks, and with the approval of Pippin, sailed down the Rhine to Friesland. Here he is said to have baptized many; on the 5th July, 755, he was busied with the confirmation of many newly baptized persons in the neighbourhood of the modern Dokkum, when a mob of heathen Frisians fell upon him, and slew him along with his people, to whom he had forbidden any defence.

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

Italy, the Popes and the Frankish Power.

Sources: the **Liber Pontificalis** (*vid.* i. 340); the Letters of Gregory I. in his Opp. ed. Par. II., Ml. 75. The first four Books of the *Regesta* ed. P. Ewald, 1887 (Mg. Ep. I.); the collection of Papal missives to the Carolingian princes, instituted by Charlemagne (739-791); **Codex Carolinus** ed. CENNI, *Mon. domin. Pontif. Romæ*, 1760; also Ml. 98, and specially in JAFFÉ, Br. G. IV. (*Mon. Carol.*) 1867. *Literature:* N. BAXMANN, *Die politik der Päpste von Grg. I. bis Gr. VII.* Vol. I. Elberfeld 1868. J. LANGEN, *Geschichte der röm. Kirche*, 2 vols., Bonn. 1885. *Jahrbb. des fränk. Reiches* (Karls d. gr.) by ABEL and SIMSON.

AT the beginning of this period Gregory I. occupied the Roman see. (*vid.* i. 354). Immersed in the spirit of monastic piety, and nourished on the chief Church Fathers of the West, from whom he drew without dogmatic acuteness, but with the churchly feeling of his time, he exercised the deepest influence on succeeding times, in directing them towards the liturgical fixing of the cultus and the promotion of ecclesiastical legalism, work-holiness and faith. In his imposing personality, the church as a saving power at the same time availed itself of the service of a worldly-wise talent for administration. Since the Lombard conquest of Italy, the Bishops of Rome stood between the Greek Emperors, whose subjects they still were, and the Arian conquerors, who after the time of the polycracy (36 dukes) were held together under an autocratic royal rule under AUTHARI, and then AGILULF, Duke of Turin (590-616). AGILULF (p. 41), under the influence of his Catholic wife THEUDELINDE, allowed his son to be baptized a Catholic, and received Columba in a friendly manner, when he came to Italy, and there founded the monastery of **Bobbio**, which was so important an influence for Christianity and Catholicism. Injurious to the advance of the Catholic creed was indeed the opposition in which the North-Italian and Illyrian bishops stood to Rome on account of its acceptance of the so-called Fifth Œcumenical Council (Thee Chapter Controversy, *vid.* i. 352 sq.). Aquileia remained reluctant, and Gregory rather silenced than overcame the scruples of Theudelinde and Columba. But under Theudelinde's reign as guardian, and under ADALWALD himself, the Catholic creed

made important advances, and under ARIPERT (652) and GRIMOALD (662-671), it gained complete victory. But the blending of Lombard with Roman life advanced in the same measure.

Although in Gregory's time the territory of Rome belonged to the Eastern Roman Empire as one of the Duchies under the Exarch of Ravenna, the Pope, as a matter of fact, ruled here as master, supported by the great property in land of the Roman Church, the patrimony of S. Peter, gradually increased since the time of Constantine, and which afforded rich revenues and was free from taxes and state-burdens. Rome's possessions lay not only in Italy, Sicily, and Corsica, but also in Illyria, Dalmatia and Gaul, and even in Africa and Asia. To their administration Gregory applied great attention and care. In the ruined condition of Italy they gave him the means of coming to the assistance of the oppressed Romans to an extraordinary extent, of redeeming captives, and becoming the fosterer of Rome. Left in the lurch by the Greek Emperor and the Exarch, he led the defence of Rome against the Lombards, and himself concluded treaties with them.

He sought chiefly to guard against the disorders of the Church in the **Roman patriarchal diocese**, and not unsuccessfully, by supervision of the bishops, measures of ecclesiastical discipline, the elevation of the clerical class and the promotion of the monastic institutions. But he also emphatically vindicated the authority and **privileges of the Roman see** in the wider sphere. The metropolitan see of **Achrida**, erected by Justinian I. for Illyria, was obliged to receive the pallium from Gregory according to the ancient claims of Rome upon Illyria. In conflict with the Bishop of Salona he brought the authority of Rome into recognition in West Illyria. The hitherto independent metropolises of North Italy, **Milan**, and **Ravenna**, which had been made prominent by the residence of the Exarch, both of which had abolished communion with Rome in the Three Chapter Controversy, Gregory succeeded in reuniting, and even in forcing to recognise Rome as a court of appeal, while certainly the Patriarch of **Aquileia** (Venetia and Istria), who had settled on the island of **Grado** since the Lombard invasion, adhered to his schism and autocephaly. Gregory's predecessor Pelagius II. had already taken grave objection to the usage which had arisen for some time in the Greek Church, of honouring the Bishop of Constantinople with the title of *ἐπίσκοπος οἰκουμένης*¹ and for that reason had declared the Acts of the Synod of Constantinople (588) to be null. As a matter of fact it was intended in this way to de-

¹ H. Gelzer JprTh. XIII. 549-584.

signate the Church in Constantinople as the head of all others.¹ Gregory made it a matter of reproach to the patriarch JOHN JEJUNATOR (*νηστεύτης*), that he allowed himself to be given this "Anti-Christian" title, and also repudiated it when Eulogius of Alexandria desired to honour him himself by the same title; for he did not regard that as to his own honour which lessened that of his brethren. Yet he himself laid claim to a certain right of supervision over the Church of Constantinople, and when the Emperor MAURITIUS, who had taken the side of his patriarch, was overthrown by PHOCAS, Gregory congratulated the usurper, who designated the Church of Rome *caput omnium ecclesiarum*.

In the **African Church** Gregory combated with combined pliability and energy, the remains of the constitutional independence of the ancient Church. In **Spain**, Leander of Seville, who was specially active in favour of the victory of the Catholic creed under Recared, was a close friend of Gregory. The Spanish Church thus came, at least at first, into some relation to Rome. In the Frankish kingdom Gregory indeed stood in high authority, and from the very beginning he had sought to place the Anglo-Saxon Church under Roman guidance. But, while in the seventh century, in Italy, the political authority of the Bishops of Rome increased with the degradation of the Church, their influence on the ecclesiastical government of the Germanic national Churches grew smaller, even in England, where the Roman order gained the victory over the ancient British, and where the reverence for S. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, was very warm.

The Roman Bishop THEODORE (from 642), and again, his successor MARTIN I., in spite of the protest of the ancient sees of Antioch and Alexandria, appointed a Roman vicar for Palestine, which had been withdrawn from Greek rule by the Arab conquest, and at the same time Martin vindicated the dogmatic authority of the Roman see against Byzantium in the Monothelete controversy (Lateran Synod of 649, *vid sup.* p. 8 sq.), on account of which, it is true, he was imprisoned and exiled. But the humiliation of his next successor under the Greek court-theology was followed by the dogmatic triumph, which AGATHO (678-682) celebrated at the sixth Œcumenical Council (680-681), certainly at the sacrifice of the authority of his predecessor Honorius.² At the same time the Bishop of Ravenna,

¹ *Vid.* Cod. Justin. I. 2, 24. The title had not the innocent signification which Anastasius Bibliothecarius in the ninth century allowed to be applied to him by the Greeks, in order to pacify them. *Vid.* Langen, l. c. II. 412, note.

² Agatho had vindicated the claim of Rome to the possession of pure doctrine

who had made use of the previous tension between Constantinople and Rome, compelled by the Emperor Constantius Pogonatus, was forced to subordinate himself to Rome. The Concilium Quinisextum (692) indeed, again came into opposition to Rome (p. 11) and revealed the beginning of the struggle towards separation between East and West, but Rome's authority in the West was not thereby shaken. Sergius I. of Rome refused to accept the decision, and when Justinian II. would have obtained possession of him and of Constans Martinus, the garrison of Ravenna revolted; subsequently also (701), the mere suspicion of the use of forcible measures against John VI. produced an insurrection against the Exarch. Justinian II. after his restoration, actually overwhelmed the Pope Constantine with honours. When Philippicus Bardanes (711-713) once more desired to make Monotheletism dominant, his name was excluded in Rome from the prayers of the Church. Constantine had also attempted to take steps against the violence done the Church in the Visigothic kingdom by Witiza; but the speedily ensuing conquest of Spain by the Moors withdrew the Spanish Church from the influence of Rome. The subjection of the Lombards to Roman Catholicism, which had meanwhile been completed, also involved an altered relationship to Aquileia. At one time, the Emperor Heraclius (629), to please the Roman see, had expelled the Patriarch FORTUNATUS, who persisted in his independence, from **Grado**, and set a Roman deacon in his stead. But Fortunatus had returned to Aquileia, and had here asserted himself further, under Lombard rule, as Bishop of Venetia and Istria. Now, however, at a synod brought about by the Lombard king CUNINCBERT at **Pavia** (ca. 698), where the Aquileians accepted both the fifth and the sixth Œcumenical Synods, there ensued an ecclesiastical agreement, in consequence of which the schism between SERGIUS of Rome and PAULINUS of Aquileia was abolished, and the latter subordinated himself to Rome.¹ However, his relation to Rome, like that of Milan and Ravenna, always remained free. These bishops did not take an oath to the Pope, like those of Central Italy, and subsequently again attempted repeatedly to assert their complete independence.

The **Image-Controversies** specially contributed to loosen the relation by appeal to Luke xxii. 32, and yet Rome, in order to carry Martin's doctrine, was now obliged to assent to the express condemnation of Honorius as a heretic. Agatho's successor, Leo II., also expressly acknowledged this, and for a long time the Popes, when entering on office, were obliged to declare it expressly. *Vid. Liber Diurnus* in MI. 105, col. 52.

¹ Paulus, *Hist. Langob.* VI. 14 and *Carmen de Synodo Ticinensi* in *Mss. Script. Langob.* pp. 189-191.

tionship of the Roman bishops to the Byzantine Empire, and caused them, on the contrary, to seek their point of support in the West. Gregory II. (715-731) sternly opposed the Emperor Leo the Isaurian (p. 14 sq.) and long refrained from interfering with a revolt which broke out in the Greek possessions in Italy. The taxes were withheld, and it was made to appear as though an Italian Emperor would be elected. Gregory did not, indeed, allow matters to go so far, lest he should fall into the power of the powerful Lombard king Liutprand (712-744). Gregory instigated the Dux Venetiarum to regain Ravenna, already conquered by the Lombards, for Greek rule, and the latter handed over the fortified town of Sutri, which had hitherto belonged to the Exarchate, after he had again taken it from the Lombards, to the Pope, with all rights of sovereignty, whereby the basis of the latter's secular dominion was laid.

The hostile attitude of Gregory II. and Gregory III. to Leo the Isaurian caused Rome the loss of the ecclesiastical province of Illyria (*vid.* p. 14), but so much the more did the Popes seek a firm footing in the West, where also WILLIBRORD in Friesland and BONIFACE in Germany now worked on their commission. Hardly pressed by Liutprand, who had conquered a great part of the Roman Duchy, Gregory III. sought alliance with the Frankish power, repeatedly summoning Charles Martel to his help against the Lombards and solemnly summoning him to the protection of S. Peter by the transmission of the golden key of Peter's tomb. But Charles stood in need of Liutprand's help against the Arabs, and did not allow himself to be detached from his neutral attitude, but sought to mediate.

Pope ZACHARIAS (741-752) reaped the fruits of the activity of Boniface in Germany and in the barbarised Frankish Church, which brought the latter as well as the Frankish mayors of the palace into nearer relationship with Rome. This supple personage succeeded at the same time in getting upon a friendly footing with Liutprand, who on his part desired to make use of the Pope, in order to become complete master of Italy. Liutprand gave up all the papal patrimonies he had seized, and gifted to the Pope four cities in the Roman duchy, as the independent ruler of which he treated him. But at the same time Zacharias bound himself to the Frankish ruler Pippin, who, after the withdrawal of his brother Carlmann, had in his hands the whole power of the Frankish kingdom. Behind the actual rulers there still always stood the *rois fainéants* of the sacred Merovingian race, a condition, which in certain circumstances might bring peril to the whole work of the Pippinids, which had been done with so much energy and ability. Pippin then sent Bishop

Burkhard of Würzburg and his influential chaplain Abbot Fuldrad to Pope Zacharias; he desired to quell the scruples which opposed his steps by means of a spiritual authority. Zacharias declared that it was better that he who possessed power should also receive the name of king, so that order should not be endangered (751).¹ In consequence of this Pippin was raised on the shield by the Franks at the Diet of Soissons (October or November, 751) and anointed king by Boniface.²

The Bishop of Rome had soon to look to the new Frankish king for help. The Lombard king AISTULF (749 till 756) conquered the Exarchate and pressed hard on the Pope, who was left without help from Byzantium. Pope STEPHEN II. (752-757) then turned to Pippin and betook himself, under escort sent by the latter, to France, where he was most honourably received by the Franks, and once more anointed Pippin and his sons Kings of the Franks. After vain attempts by Pippin to bring about mediation between the Pope and the Lombards, the assistance of the Franks was promised to the Pope at an assembly of the kingdom at **Carisiacum** (Kierzy on the Oise, a royal castle near Noyon) in 754. The domains and properties belonging to the Roman Church, of which Aistulf had taken possession, were to be given up to her. Pippin was obliged to move twice against Aistulf (754 sqq.); what was rescued from the latter, he gave over to the Pope (**Donatio Pippini** 756);³ he himself,

¹ So, according to the *Annales Lauriss.* of the year 749. Agreeing as to the fact, the continuator Fredeg. Chron. Appendix to Gregory of Tours' *De Gloria Martyrum* of the year 767. In Bouquet, V. 9.

² This statement of the *Annales Lauriss.* is often controverted, as by Rettberg, I. 386, and many others. It is sought to explain the admission of this narrative into the Annals of Lorsch which was nearly related to the Carolingian house, from the interest of the dynasty, but *vid.* on the other hand, Hauck, I. 530. The conjecture that Pope Zacharias did not desire to take on himself the responsibility for the change of the throne, and that therefore his representative, Boniface, must also have remained non-participant (Alberdingk-Thym, Ulrich), lacks any positive foundation; Boniface's personal attitude towards the important step cannot be certainly determined. Rettberg's view, that Pippin's step was rather antipathetic to him, cannot be positively proved; Ebrard, on the contrary, sees in Boniface the real instigator, who at the price of the suppression of the alleged "Culdee-Church" offered Pippin the royal crown. This falls in with his whole hypothesis.

³ The charter of Kierzy is not preserved; the narrative of the *Liber Pontificalis* (*vita Hadriani* in MI. 128, col. 1179) as to the literal repetition of this gift by Charlemagne (774), according to which it must have included nearly the whole of Italy, cannot be maintained. The deliverance of Pippin must have referred to the Duchy of Rome and conterminous city-districts of the Exarchate, as also to the enjoyment of the papal possessions outside of the ecclesiastical state. On the very numerous researches on this point *vid.* H. von

however, claimed the dignity of the Roman patriciate, *i.e.* a protectorate. This relationship, in itself still fluctuating, although a nominal subordination to the Greek Emperor was still maintained, furnished the foundation on the one hand of the practical detachment from the Eastern Empire and of an exercise by the Pope of rights of political supremacy, on the other hand of the protectorate of the Frankish king over Italy, and therefore paved the way for the subsequent feudal relationship. At first, indeed, the oppressions continued. Under Paul I., DESIDERIUS (757-774) Duke of Tuscany fell upon the youthful State of the Church with armed force. The claim of the Pope to a political position without adequate power, and with only transitory support from Pippin, seemed only to result to the detriment of the papacy, as was shown by the party conflicts after Paul's death. STEPHEN III. (768-772) even found himself threatened by an alliance of the Frankish power with the Lombard Desiderius. After Pippin's death (768) the elder son CHARLES, at the desire of Desiderius and the instigation of his mother, in spite of the forcible dissuasion of the Pope, allied himself with the Lombard princess Desiderata, although to do so he had first to repudiate his Frankish wife; but after one year only he separated from her. Next, when after the death of his brother CARLMANN (Austrasia) Charles took possession of his province, Desiderius received his widow and children, demanded of Pope HADRIAN I. (772-795) the anointing of Carlmann's eldest son as King of Austrasia and, when he refused, oppressed him to the utmost. Charles then interfered, besieged Desiderius in Pavia, took him prisoner, sent him to the monastery in Corvey, and announced himself King of the Franks and Lombards (776). But while the siege of Pavia was still in progress, Charles went to Rome, where he was brilliantly received, and confirmed Pippin's donation (probably also increased it). Later too, when Charles conquered the hitherto independent Duke Arichis of Benevento, and brought his domain under Frankish supremacy, a still further increase of the donation to the Pope took place (787). In Italy, and even in the Papal Domain, Charles now decidedly exercised the rights of the lord of the land and rejected the lofty claims of Hadrian, with all respect for the papal authority. The Pope and the subjects of the ecclesiastical state were obliged to take oath to him, and his emissaries (*missi dominici*), as representatives of the royal power, exercised rights of

SYBEL, *Über d. Schenkungen*, etc., in HZ. 1880 and *Kleine histor. Schriften*, III. 1880; also NIEHUES and HUEFFER in JGG. 1881 and G. KAUFMANN *D. G. II.* 415 sqq. ABEL, JB. p. 161.

supervision over the papal officials, and received complaints, appeals, etc. But the rights over the Church, election of bishops, ecclesiastical legislation and Church government, to which the Frankish rulers had already laid claim, naturally gave rise to the corresponding attitude towards the Roman Church. If until this time the idea of the unity of the Christian world, in spite of any interruption of it in actual fact, had always attached itself to the Greek Empire, there was now more and more completed that revolution, which for the Christians of the West placed the centre of gravity in the new Franco-Germanic power. As early as 777 Hadrian had designated King Charles the *novus Christianissimus Dei Constantinus Imperator*; from 781 he ceased to date his Bulls by the years of the reigns of the Greek Emperors. In 788, indeed, when the revolution in the image question had again restored the alliance with Rome, he addressed the Emperor Constantine and his mother Irene as "*nostros principes et imperatores*." But under Hadrian's successor LEO III. (795-816) the new relationship found decided expression. Leo had been raised to the papacy on the day after Hadrian's death, amid violent party conflicts, and had at once sent the keys of Peter's tomb and the banner of Rome to Charles, with the petition that he would receive the people of Rome in sworn fidelity. Charles praised his humility and his promise of loyalty, but at the same time caused him to be exhorted by his ambassador, Abbot Angilbert, to an honourable life, faithful obedience to the canons of the Church, and to the putting away of simony. When therefore, in 799, Leo was fallen upon by the opposition (Hadrian's kindred) during a procession, and had with difficulty escaped maltreatment, the Frankish Duke Winnigis of Spoleto brought him to Charles at Paderborn. His enemies also appeared here and accused him of perjury and adultery. In the autumn of 799 Leo was carried back to Rome by Frankish bishops (Hildibald of Cologne and Arn of Salzburg and others) and there solemnly received. Commissioned by Charles with an investigation, his ambassadors did not however venture on a decision in Rome, but sent Leo's accusers to Charles, in order that he might give judgment upon them. In the following year Charles crossed the Alps, and a synod was held in his presence in Rome in November, 800, which finally freed the Pope from the accusations and only left him of his own accord to take the oath of purification, which Leo did.¹ Soon thereafter, at Christmas, 800,

¹ The narrative of the *Liber Pontificalis*, according to which the bishops declared that they did not dare to judge the Pope, etc., requires to be supplemented by the Frankish Annals, according to which Charles sat for seven days in judgment between Leo and his opponents.

Charles, at mass in St. Peter's, sat opposite the altar, when the Pope at the conclusion of the office advanced to him, and placed a gold crown on his head, and the populace greeted him as a divinely crowned Augustus, and Emperor of the Romans. Thereupon Leo performed the anointment of Charles and his son Pippin and did homage to the former.

Charles afterwards declared, that if he had known what the Pope intended, he would have absented himself from church in spite of the high festival. This has been regarded as a merely feigned opposition to an act which was probably prepared beforehand, and which demonstrably agreed with the ideas of Charles's Frankish surroundings. On the other hand Döllinger conjectured, that Charles's effort, to represent in his power the unity of Christendom, had really in view a higher aim; he did not so much wish to place a Western Empire alongside of the Eastern, as to become the legitimate heir of the Empire in general. His irritated conduct on the image question is thus thought to have been aimed at showing the Emperor Constantine and his mother Irene unworthy of empire (a woman was not capable of succession), and he was then, to a certain extent against his will, forced by his own *entourage* and the Pope, into the path which had been struck out by the latter. But the opposition of Charles is capable of explanation other than this always doubtful hypothesis (cf. Hauck, II. 101 sq.).

For the Papacy the result of this procedure was at first to strengthen and confirm its political subordination to Charles. If in subsequent times, conversely, inferences were drawn from the coronation of the Emperor by the Pope in favour of the superiority of rank of the spiritual power and authority over the secular, this does not correspond to the contemporary conceptions, for the coronation did not appear as an act of papal, divinely furnished, absolute power over the Franks and their king, but as an act of election of the Romans and their *Res publica*, represented by the Pope. Leo himself rendered homage to Charles, and was obliged to sign Charles's testament, in which Rome appears as one of the metropolitan sees alongside of Ravenna, Milan, etc. The Pope is the first bishop of the Carolingian Empire, but under the Emperor, like the rest.

The so-called Donation of Constantine.

Sources: The text in the **pseudo-Isidorian Decretals**, ed. Hinschius, p. 249, sqq., also in FRIEDRICH, *Die Constant. Schenkung*, 179-197, and a new revision by ZEUMER, 1888 (*vid. inf.*).—*Literature*: of the modern literature on the subject, to be noted are, J. DÖLLINGER, *Pap.-fabeln des MA.*, München 1863, 2nd ed. J. FRIEDRICH, Stuttg. 1890. W. MARTENS, *Die röm. Frage unter Pippin und Karl d. Gr.*, Stuttgart 1881. Id. *Die falsche Generalconcession Const. d. Gr.* München 1889. H. GRANERT in JGG. 3 and vol. 4. D. H. BRUNNER, *Die Const. Schenkungsurkunde*, I. *Das Constitutum Const.'s* II. ZEUMER, *Der älteste Text*. Berlin 1888 (From the Festschrift in honour of Gneist). A. HAUCK in ZWL. 1888, 207. L. Weiland in

ZKR. XXII. 137. I. FRIEDRICH, *Die constantinische Schenkung*, Nördlingen 1889. SCHEFFER BOYCHORST, *Neuere Forschungen* in MIOG. X., 302. KRÜGER in ThLZ. 1889, Nos. 17 and 18. SEEBERG in ThLBl. 1890, Nos. 3-5. LÖHNING in HZ. vol. 66, 193.

The fable of the **Constitutum Constantini**, owes its origin, as it seems, to the circumstances under Popes Stephen II. (III.) and Paul I., when the papacy, being oppressed by the Lombards, sought and found help from Pippin, and the first foundations of its secular dominion were laid, and Pippin would have sacrificed the blood of the Franks, not for the Greeks, but for S. Peter. It rests on the older legend of SYLVESTER, the fable of the miraculous cure and conversion wrought by Sylvester on the Emperor Constantine, who had been attacked by leprosy, and who turned his favour upon the Bishop of Rome. The legend which exalts the authority of the Roman Church (even against Byzantium), can be traced back as far as about the time of Pope Symmachus (i. 350), and is gradually enriched. **Acts** of Sylvester are already designated apocryphal in the *Decretum Gelasii de libris recipiendis* (i. 350). The *vitæ Sylvestri et Liberii* in the Liber Pontificalis, the *Gesta Liberii* and other legends are based upon it (cf. Duchesne's edition of the Lib. Pontif. p. cxiii. and FRIEDRICH, l.c. 79-107). The **Constitutum Constantini** now makes use of and develops this material, makes Constantine himself relate his conversion, and communicate his confession *in extenso*, and puts in his mouth the greatest exaltations of the Roman Church, which holds the highest spiritual primacy and is to receive higher honours and distinctions than even the Imperial power. Constantine presents Sylvester with the Lateran palace, the city of Rome, **all the Provinces and cities in Italy and the Western regions**, and surrenders them to the *potestas* and *ditio* of the Pope; the Pope only repudiates the golden crown as incompatible with the *corona clericatus*. But on account of this donation Constantine transfers his seat from Rome to Byzantium, as the Emperor ought to have no secular power in the place where the Lord of Heaven has established the priestly principedom. The author, or more correctly, completer of this legend is to be sought in Rome at the time indicated. He gave to the glorification of Constantine and Sylvester an application, which, even if the vindication of such extensive rights of dominion for the papal see was not seriously to be thought of, could not fail to make an impression on men's minds. GRAUERT's learnedly carried out attempt to ascribe the forgery to the West-Frankish Church and the date 840, is correctly rejected by Friedrich, Brunner, and others; but the placing of its origin at about 816 (Weiland and Brunner) is also incorrect. The earlier perception, that Hadrian I. already betrays knowledge of the forgery, is luminously confirmed by Friedrich (l.c. 4-20). The authorship is with greater probability transferred to Rome and the time of the Roman bishops, Stephen II. or Paul I. The acute attempt of Friedrich to distinguish in the present text of the **Constitutum Constantini**, an older writing belonging to the seventh century, from the closing part only added shortly before 754, cannot, however, be maintained in this form (*vid.* Seeberg, l.c.). The fantastic legend acquired very real power in the Middle Ages.

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

The Christianization of the Saxons; beginnings of the Slavs and Avars.

Sources: EINHARD'S *Vita Caroli Magni*, MGS. II. and in JAFFÉ, BrG. IV. 487. Translation by Abel in GDV.; EIGIL, *Vita Sturmii*; ALTFRIDI *Vita Liudgeri*; ANSKARI *Vita Willehadi*, all in MGS. II. *Translatio S. Liborii*, MGS. VI. Besides these, the various Frankish annals and ADAM of Bremen, *Gesta pontif. Hammaburg*, MGS. VII. and ed. Lappenb., 2nd ed. Hannover 1876. Translation by Laurent in GDV.—*De conversione Bagoar. et Carant. libellus*, MGS. II. 7 sqq. *Literature*: *Jahrb. d. fränkischen Reichs unter Karl d. Gr.*, by ABEL and SIMSON, 2 vols. 1866 (1888) and 1883.

After the Saxons, from the time of the destruction of the great Thuringian kingdom in 530, had pressed on southward as far as the Unstrut, and later, in the seventh and the beginning of the eighth century, under pressure of the Bructerii had come across the Lippe and the Ruhr, as far as the Rhine, the hostile opposition of the Franks became ever more decidedly evident, and made their Christianization at the same time as their subjection the political problem of Charles, the Christian king.

1. **Before the time of the Saxon wars** we know of isolated missionary attempts. The activity of the two EWALDS, the black and the white, who are said to have suffered martyrdom about the end of the seventh century, lies entirely in obscurity (Bede, H.E., V. 10). SUIDBERT, a companion of Willibrord's (*vid. sup.* p. 64), next worked among the Bructerii on the Upper Ems, and then, being expelled by the Saxons, founded a monastery on an island in the Rhine between Düsseldorf and Duisburg (Kaiserswerth), presented to him by Pippin. He was thus regarded as the apostle of the **Berg** country. Boniface already directed his view towards his dangerous neighbours, and in Carlmann's and Pippin's marches into the Weser districts, and eastwards as far as the so-called North Schwabengau (between the Harz and the Elbe, south of the Bode), free preaching and baptism are mentioned among the conditions of peace; traces of individual Christian foundations are also found.

CHARLES at first, from 772, made marches in the manner of Pippin and Carlmann into the middle of Saxony, in order to make the rapacious Saxons feel his power, took at that time the so-called Eresburg (Burg of the War God, Ziu), near the modern Stadtberg

on the Diemel, and destroyed Irminsul, which lay further north. From 775 he proceeded to their entire subjection to Frankish rule and Christianity. After the campaigns of 775-776 the **Diet of Paderborn** in 777 marks a period. The Saxons swore loyalty to Charles, received officials from among their own nobility, and many were baptized. But WIDUKIND induced the Saxons to complete rebellion; his converted fellow-countrymen had to take flight like the Christian priests. Charles came as far as the Eastphalians and Slavs on the Elbe, and avenged the defeat in the Suintal brought about by treason, by the slaughter of 4,500 surrendered Saxons at **Verden** on the **Aller** (782). The general revolt of the Saxons was quelled by the battles at **Detmold** and on the **Hase** (783), and Charles sought to fortify the rule of the Christian Church by severity (**Diet of Paderborn**, 785). After his march as far as the Bardengau, WIDUKIND and ABBIO agreed to receive baptism, which followed at Attigny.¹ At Charles's desire the Pope appointed a general feast of thanksgiving for Christendom; but the Saxons once more broke loose, when in 793 Charles demanded forced service against the Avars. In the conflicts of the following years Charles came as far as Bardowiek and into the marshland between the Elbe and the Weser. The Transalbingian Saxons murdered the ambassadors of the king in 788. The **Obotrites**, who were hostile to the Saxons, now became Charles's allies. In the midst of these conflicts the Saxon Paderborn saw Pope Leo with Charles in 799. After a new advance by Charles into Saxony, he led away the Transalbingian Saxons and those from the district of Wigmodi (neighbourhood of Bremen), with their women and children into Franconia, and gave their district to the Obotrites. Practically and formally also this ended the war,² and indeed "*Ea condicione, ut abjecto dæmonum cultu et Francis adunati unus cum eis populus efficeretur*" (Einhard). As a matter of fact the Saxons retained their hereditary law (beginning of the *lex Saxonum*) and self-government under condition of the acceptance of the Christian religion and subjection under the royal counts and the royal legislation.

From the very beginning Charles kept in view, equally with the subjection of the Saxons, the planting of Christianity, as inevitable and natural; he took a clerical retinue with him and sought to place the districts which were made accessible by his arms under the spiritual care of older Christian foundations in the Frankish

¹ *Vid Caroli epist. ad Offam.*, ASB., Jan. 1. 381.

² As to the alleged peace of Selz or Salz *vid.* Simson, l.c., 590 sqq.

kingdom.¹ Individual attempts were made from Friesland in support of the mission, *e.g.* by the Anglo-Saxon Lebuin (Liafwin). Charles allured and terrified until the battle on the Hase without great results. He now proceeded with inexorable strictness in the **Capitula, quæ de partibus Saxonie constituta sunt**,² which impose the penalty of death on the murder of priests (without remitting the weregild or composition), so also on human sacrifices, leagues with heathen, robbery and destroying of churches, and even on the refusal of baptism, persistence in heathenism, burning of corpses and breaking of fasts apart from cases of necessity. On the other hand the churches received the right of asylum in the case of every crime; he who fled to them remained unattacked till the next diet of justice, and even then had security for life and limb. Voluntary confession to the priest, also, with the acceptance of penance was a security against capital punishment. It is true that there were also imposed on the Saxons the equipment of the churches with landed property by the members of the community, and the greatly hated tithe of property and gains, of which Alcuin said, that even the Franks who were born in the Christian faith only agreed to render it in full on actual compulsion.

The baptism of WIDUKIND, at which Charles himself took the place of sponsor, was without doubt of great influence; from that time onwards he remained loyal to the Church and to Charles, and promoted the building of churches. The sons also of noble Saxons, whom Charles retained as hostages and caused to be educated by different bishops and monasteries of his kingdom, helped to accustom the Saxons to Christianity. Later, when Charles thought his aim in the main matter was attained, he mitigated these bloody laws and placed the Saxons more on an equal footing with the Franks. Thus, at Aix-La-Chapelle in 797 the traditional German compensation (weregild) was again allowed, only that for the injury of a priest or church property it was to be doubled, and for the murder of a royal envoy, tripled.

Tradition mostly carries back the foundation of the **Saxon bishoprics** as far as the early times of the Saxon conflicts. But they first grew gradually out of the initial mission stations. For

¹ *E.g.* the neighbourhood of the Diemel under Sturm and his monks; the Verden neighbourhood under the monastery of Amorbach. Others under Frankish bishoprics.

² MGL. *Capitularia r. Fr.*, ed. Boretius, I. 68. As to the date of their composition *vid.* HAUCK, II. 250 note 2. WAITZ and others assume 782, PERTZ and RETTBERG, 785, BORETIUS generally from 775 to 790; Hauck is inclined to come down to 787 or 788.

regular bishops more important cities and security of conditions were still lacking; they also appeared to the Saxons too much as officials of the king alongside of the counts. It was only after the end of the war that, along with the quick growth of Christianity, the episcopal sees rose into prosperity.

The following are prominent:—

1. For **Westphalia**: *a. Münster* (Mimigærneford), where earlier during the war an Abbot Bernard had worked; about 803 Liudger was made bishop, after his Frisian ministry, and after he had also been elsewhere active in the foundation of monasteries. Along with that of Münster between the Lippe and the middle course of the Ems, the five Frisian districts (*vid. sup.* p. 65) were combined. *b. Osnabrück*, north from Münster, on the Hase, the beginnings of which seem to fall somewhat earlier still. But besides, the south-western parts of Saxon Westphalia, on the Rhur and as far as the Lippe (Berg-country and Sauerland) were attached to the older bishopric of Cologne.

2. For **Engern**: *a. Paderborn*, at first Sturm's domain, then placed under the care of the Bishop of Würzburg; shortly before Charles's death (about 806) there appears here a bishop of Saxon descent, Hathumar, who as a Saxon hostage had been educated in Würzburg. *b. Minden*. *c. Bremen*. A friend of Liudger's, the Northumbrian Willehad, who had wrought as a missionary since 770 in Friesland (Dokkum and farther to the north-east) was as a presbyter invited by Charles about 781 to the Saxons on the Lower Weser (Gau Wigmodi). In consequence of the Saxon revolt in 782, he went to Utriusti, the outmost part of Rüstringerland (Grand Duchy of Oldenburg on both sides of the Jahde), thence by water to Friesland and then to Italy. Among those who remained behind, who had to suffer persecution, a cleric in Thiatmaresgaho (Dithmarschen) is mentioned. After the baptism of Widukind (785) Willehad returned from the monastery of Echternach and received (which is typical of Charles's method of procedure) for his support in his work and that of his companions the cell (*i.e.* the small monastery without a church) of Justina (Mont Justin in Upper Burgundy); it was not till 787 that he received episcopal consecration in Worms. He died in 789. His successor WILLERICH, on account of the renewed outbreak of war and numerous revolts, could only take possession of his see from about 805; from that time onwards is reckoned the proper foundation of the bishopric of Bremen. *d. Verden*. The assertion that Suidbert was bishop here, seems to rest on mistaking this place for Verda (*i.e.* Kaiserswerth). The mission here was worked from the monastery of Amorbach, the abbot of which, Patto (Pacificus), is accordingly named as the first bishop, but he died at Amorbach in 788.

3. For Eastphalia are to be named: *a. Hildesheim*, which, however, does not appear till the time of Lewis the Pious. **Halberstadt** for North Thuringia, as asserted, at first in Seligenstadt,¹ which is sought to be identified with Osterwieck.

The relations of Liudger to Halberstadt and Helmstedt are uncertain. Besides, parts of Engern and Eastphalia were also attached to Mayence.

2. In the **South-East of Germany** Duke Thassilo of Bavaria, who had long been able practically to withdraw himself entirely from

¹ *Annal. Quedlinb.* for the year 781. Here, as elsewhere, Hildegim, Bishop of Châlons, and the brother of Liudger, is wrongly given as the founder.

the Frankish supremacy, in order to secure his rule had arranged ecclesiastical affairs on the foundations laid by Boniface and had liberally equipped churches and monasteries, and at the same time had made dependent on him the **Carantani** in Carinthia, Styria, and the eastern Tyrol, and supported the mission work of Bishop VIRGIL of Salzburg by founding monasteries. After the death of Duke CHEITMAR (about 789), who was zealously devoted to the church, a reaction indeed followed; all priests had to flee the country, but Thassilo soon interfered again. WALTUNG, the new Duke of the Carantani, begged priests of Virgil. ARN (ARNO) of Salzburg continued this work, by which the authority and power of the see of Salzburg was essentially raised.

In consequence of the victorious wars of Charles against the **Avars**, Christianity was also spread here in the south-eastern mark. The Avar chieftain, Tudun, appeared in 795-796 with a great retinue at Aix before Charles, submitted himself and received baptism. He indeed soon fell away again. But the missionary efforts were continued from Aquileia and Salzburg as centres, not without success, supported by Charles's measures for the regulation of the affairs of the Avars. However soon afterwards the latter disappear from history.

CHAPTER NINTH.

The Franko-Germanic Church in the time of Charlemagne, Ecclesiastical Order, Hierarchy and Church Government.

Sources: **Capitularia reg. Franc.** (p. 67), **Cod. Carol.** (p. 84), **ALCUIN's Epp.** in Jaffé BrG. V. (Mon. Alcuin.) 1873. *Literature*: **RETTBERG**, II. 582 sqq. **HAUCK**, II. 185 sqq. **HATCH**, *The Growth of Church Institutions*, translated by A. Harnack, 1887.

THE Roman institutions of the Church of the Empire also remained the essential foundations for the Germanic Church; but, in consequence of the total alteration in social and political relationships, they suffered very essential transformations. Already, in the Church of the Empire, the undivided and compact episcopal **community** had developed into the episcopal **diocese**, which, however, in conception retained the idea of being the ecclesiastical unit. The prominent importance of the **city-bishops** in the Roman provinces overrun by the Germans, in Gaul, has been mentioned (*vid.* p. 67 sq.); but it was of a similar sort in Italy and Spain. But the converted Germans (Franks) gave an entirely new importance to the rural populace. The churches which arose on the rural properties fell into peril of being detached from the regulated alliance with the episcopal organization. This was still more the case in the districts in which the Roman administration, and along with it the episcopal constitution of the Church, had not attained sufficient solidity or was till non-existent altogether. Here the mission advanced independently, attached itself to monastic settlements (the monastic churches of Columba), or, the missionary priests or bishops sought their support from the properties of newly-converted landholders, by whom churches or chapels were erected. **Abbot-bishops** or **regional bishops** worked here, or even presbyters without episcopal consecration, in districts which did not as yet form defined dioceses. With a view to bringing order into these new circumstances, recourse was had as far as possible to the old canonical regulations of the Church. Influential missionaries, such as **WILLIBROD** in Friesland, and **Boniface** in Germany, sought attachment to the Pope, as representatives of sacred ecclesiastical order. The old principle was emphasized, that bishops were only to be instituted

in more considerable cities, and that all the clergy of a district were subordinated to the bishop, and ought to acknowledge his jurisdiction and bind themselves to him by oath. If the landowners regarded themselves as proprietors of the churches which they founded, and as those on whom the appointment, support, and dismissal of the priests of these churches depended, the reformation which began from the time of Boniface was directed towards the limitation of the rights of landowners, in accordance with ecclesiastical views. Charles declared sharply against the appointment of clergy without the consent of the bishop.¹ The proprietary rights of the builders of churches to their *ecclesie propriae*, which they might sell or bequeath, were of course recognised, and care was only taken that these churches were kept for divine worship. Against the claims of private proprietors to a share in the gifts offered to the church, Gregory the Great (*Epist.* 2, 5) had already declared according to precedents in the Spanish Church. So likewise it had been declared in the Spanish Church (Conc. Toled. V. c. 33) that the builders of churches were not to have the disposal of the property of the foundation, which rather lay under the administration of the bishop. On the other hand the individual churches had to be protected against the greed and caprice of the bishops. In Spain the founders of churches and their families, in case of the squandering or abuse of church property by the clergy, received the concession of the right (Conc. Tol. IX. can. 1.) of carrying a complaint to the bishop, and even beyond him to the metropolitan.

According to the original idea the clergy of an episcopal see were to form a unitary corporation, enrolled in the cathedral church, which from this centre was to care for urban, rural and branch churches in pursuance of the bishop's commands; but there was now developed the formation of a parochial clergy proper, **independent parish churches with an endowment of their own.** The establishment of an endowment by the builder (*patron* or *senior*) became the condition of the ecclesiastical consecration of a church by the bishop. Correspondingly, the patron himself installed the cleric whom he had chosen after he had received confirmation from the bishop. But the inclination of the church soon became predominant, to have the investiture carried out by the bishop, who, by this very fact, to a certain extent acquired a position of feudal supremacy over the clergy. Thus there arises a regular standing clergy for definite churches, the *intitulati* or *incardinati*, who now held a *potestas propria* as *parochi* in a *parochia* or as *curati* (*cura animarum*). For

¹ *Epist. in Ital. missa* in Capit. ed. Bor., p. 203.

the organic system of these separate clergy in the episcopal diocese, the distinction of the so-called *ecclesiæ baptismales* (baptism-churches) is of special importance. Under Pippin, the Concilium Vernense¹ (Verneuil on the Lower Seine, 755) ordained: that all presbyters who are in the *parochia* (i.e. here, in the episcopal diocese), are to be under the power of the bishop, no one shall presume to baptize or celebrate mass without the commission of the bishop. There shall only be a public *baptisterium*, where it has been instituted by the bishop; only in cases of necessity might every presbyter of the diocese baptize. These **baptism-churches**, to which definite villages were assigned for the purpose of revenues (tithes), are exalted above other rural churches and chapels, and in them the **Arch-presbyters** or **Deans** find their place. As they alone have the standing right of baptism, these baptism-churches appear as the **rural parishes** proper (partial parishes of the diocese), to which again the other churches with their presbyters, or rather deacons, are subordinated, as smaller branch pastorates, to which the tithes of their nearer surroundings are assigned. These **Arch-presbyters** are appointed to help to carry the burdens of their bishop; their duty is the supervision of the other presbyters.² Their parishes are designated **Christianitates**, **plebes**, and hence they themselves are called **plebani**. While they conduct the supervision of the functions in **divine worship** of the rest of the clergy, and therefore share in the so-called *potestas ordinis* of the bishops, the **Archdeacon**, although at that time of lower clerical consecration than the presbyters, as the right hand and representative of the bishop, exercises the *potestas jurisdictionis* over presbyters and even arch-presbyters. In the large German bishoprics there soon appear a number of arch-presbyters and deans, and when even that was no longer adequate, the bishoprics were divided into several archidiaconates, each of which had a number of deaneries with arch-priests under it.³

Alongside of the bishops, there appear in the Frankish kingdom in the beginning of the ninth century so-called *chor-episcopi*, who, however, have nothing to do with the officials of the same name in the ancient Church; they much rather seem to have arisen out of

¹ *Capit.* ed. Boretius, pp. 32 sq.

² *Stat. Salisb.* 18 in *Capit. Boret.* 230.

³ As to the division of the bishopric of Strassburg into seven deaneries said to have been confirmed by Pope Adrian in 774, *vid.* however, Abel-Simson, *Jahrbücher*, I. 188 (2nd ed.) according to which the relative letter of Hadrian is a later fabrication.

the regionary bishops of former times. They partly come into opposition to the clergy organized by Boniface, and are partly utilised during longer vacancies of episcopal sees, either by the princes, in order to apply the episcopal revenues to the fiscus, or by indolent bishops as substitutes.

As a rule the **choice of the lower clergy** lies in the hand of the bishop, so far as limitations do not occur through patronage (*vid. sup.*).¹ The rulers exercised the right of patronage over the churches of the crown domains. As the right of private patronage passed to others by gift or inheritance, so also, such churches, either by immediate incorporation or later donation, were incorporated with neighbouring monasteries, which then became the holders of the ecclesiastical property and the rights of patronage. Besides the churches there are also public and private chapels (oratories), the former rural and field chapels which were provided for from the parish church, the latter the chapels of bishops, monasteries and men of rank, who kept special domestic chaplains; the latter withdrew themselves from episcopal supervision under the protection of their masters, on whom they were for the most part entirely dependent as serfs. Against the ancient canon of the Church, *ne quis vage ordinetur*, which had to be departed from in mission work, there still existed many so-called **clerici vagi**, whose priestly ordination must often have served as a convenient means of earning a livelihood.

Of great importance for the re-organization of the Church was the establishment of the **metropolitan alliance**, which had not yet succeeded in establishing itself under Pippin. It was only very gradually carried out under Charles. In Germany, as has been said, Lullus, the successor of Boniface in Mayence, only received archiepiscopal rank and the papal pallium about 780, when Charlemagne set about arrangements for the increase of the German metropolitan sees. In the tenth decade of the century, Utrecht, Liège, and part of the newly founded bishoprics, which owed their origin to the conversion of the Saxons, viz. Bremen (only for a short time), Münster, Osnabrück, and Minden, were placed under Cologne, while of the new bishoprics, Mayence received Paderborn, Verden, Hildesheim and Halberstadt. As here the Saxons were kept in view, so, the elevation of **Salzburg** to an archbishopric, had in view the eastern Marks (Slavs and Avars). Arno, closely allied with Alcuin, and made use of by Charles in negotiations with Rome and missionary work among the Avars, is the

¹ Traces of election by the community in Bavaria, *vid. Hauck*, II. 376.

first Archbishop of Salzburg. Subordinate to him are the Bavarian bishoprics, until in subsequent times Passau is raised alongside of Salzburg. The Diets of the Empire frequently gave decisions as to the subordination of the suffragan-bishops (diocesan bishops) to the metropolitans.

The **election of bishops** according to Franco-Germanic custom practically lay with the kings. Carlmann did indeed tolerate the installation of bishops by Boniface as the legate of the Pope, but nominated them himself of his own absolute power. Charlemagne exercised this right with equally little limitation, but not, as was only natural, the right of confirmation and investiture.

The **effort to restore the decayed discipline of the Church** among the clergy, as kept in view by the Frankish synods under Carlmann and Pippin under the influence of Boniface, was assisted by the attempt of Bishop CHRODEGANG of Metz, to renew the so-called **canonical life** of the clergy, chiefly of the episcopal clergy, and, according to Augustine's model, to unite the clergy around the bishop in a *monasterium clericorum in domo episcopi*. The synodal decisions of the sixth and seventh centuries already strive after this, and assume that it exists here and there. Chrodegang, who belonged to the Court clergy under Charles Martel, and was at the same time *Referendarius* (chancellor), had been made Bishop of Metz by Pippin, but had been kept occupied with the affairs of the realm.¹ His rules for the episcopal clergy, whereby they were to be led to a monastic life along with the bishop, subsequently became the model for others. Lodging in common near the episcopal cathedral, and common precepts for the life there, regulated the so-called **vita canonica**, which required a common dormitory and refectory, definitely regulated service at the "hours," and reading of chapters at the same. Hence the whole institution received the name of cathedral chapter, equivalent to cathedral foundation; the individual *canonici*² were also called *capitulares*. At the head stands the bishop, next to him, the archdeacon as *præpositus* = provost, then a *primicerius*, chief of the schools which form themselves around the cathedrals. Handicrafts, study, and the copying of books are to be pursued alongside of the spiritual exercises. It was only after the time of Charlemagne that Chrodegang's Rule acquired universal authority, but in many places the

¹ He led the embassy to Rome which was to bring Pope Stephen to France.

² According to its original broader sense, *canonicus* means every cleric regularly appointed to a church, as the person, who, entered on the register or canon of the church, has a share in its revenues; now, however, *canonicus* is more accurately equivalent to *regulariter* = *canonice vivens*.

canonical life of the clergy is also to be assumed even under Charlemagne, when maintenance of the rule **that the clergy should live under the bishop, as the monks do under the abbot** is frequently inculcated. To the cathedral chapters or cathedral foundations there were attached in the course of the ninth century, the **collegiate foundations**, which were formed of the clergy of the rest of the city churches, and were presided over by a provost or dean.¹

As regards the position of the Church, the clergy and monasteries in the **organism of the state**, the Church was the first and most influential power, equipped with many privileges, and indispensable as the bearer of literary culture, hence bishops and abbots were indispensable organs in affairs of state, apart from carrying on war. Indeed, as the institution for the education of the people, the Church took over even a part of the penal power of the state. But by all these means it had at the same time grown into such close association with the secular power, that it found its head in the Christian kingship, and the king also felt himself to be at the head of the ecclesiastical organism, and made it his servant.

The older **privileges** of the clergy in the Roman state were as a whole transmitted to the Germanic and were further increased. The bishop was equal in rank to the duke, the priest to the count. For crimes and acts of violence committed against ecclesiastical persons a triple weregild was established. The **independent jurisdiction** of the **bishops** as such, apart from the spiritual disciplinary power proper (*vid. infra*), of course only extends to controversies between clerics on points of civil law; on controversies between clergymen and laymen, as well as in criminal matters, after earlier fluctuating relationships, under which the bishops had, of course, always striven for exemption, Charlemagne laid down the rule that the lower judicial authorities (Centenaries and Counts) could only proceed against a cleric with the co-operation of his bishop, but that the bishop was only subject to the judgment of the king or the provincial synod, while in general the judicial power of the king might interfere in all cases. If this refers only to the purely ecclesiastical position as such, there was in addition the position which bishops and abbots occupied as magnates of the realm, rich vassals in the service of the king, and so as a spiritual aristocracy in the land, who had equal weight with the secular lords of the soil, and who even decidedly surpassed

¹ The alleged Capitulary of Aix-la-Chapelle of 803 in reality belongs to the time of Lewis the Pious. The *regula Aquisgran.* in Mansi XIV. 153.

them in influence; hence the rights and privileges of the higher clergy as estates of the realm, their participation in the assemblies of the realm, which of course, under the Carolingians as under the Merovingians, had only a consultative voice. Connected with this was the fact that the kings, above all Charlemagne, were obliged almost exclusively to avail themselves of the higher clergy and the abbots for affairs of state, embassies and diplomatic negotiations, and that the representatives of the king in his highest judicial capacity, the **missi dominici**, always to the extent of one-half consisted of clerics. So again, however, account must be taken of the fact that the bishops and abbots in lands presented to the church by the king, enjoyed equal **immunity** with the secular vassals, the rights of the lord of the manor and the land, and so especially the raising of the fiscal revenues and the exercise of judicial powers over the vassals of the property, so that therefore the whole lower administration of justice, with reservation of the supreme royal appeal to the *missi*, lay in the hands of bishops and abbots.

This leads us to the subject of the circumstances of **church and monastic property** in general. The wealth of the Frankish Church, originating in the gifts of princes and private persons, had become extraordinarily great in the seventh century, but had then suffered most serious losses, against which the ecclesiastical reformation under Carlmann and Pippin was intended to provide assistance (*vid. supra*). The desire of the Church, to rescue ecclesiastical property from lay hands, had only led to the subjection of the lending of ecclesiastical property to laymen to regulation, under which the necessities of the Church should be to a certain extent considered. The Church had been drawn into the growing **system of benefices**. For the sake of the political interest of maintaining and strengthening his defensive power by the right of demanding military service, the ruler laid claim to the right to require, that very considerable portions of the property of the Church should be let out to magnates *sub precario et censu*, i.e. in such manner that, whoever received it as a benefice, issued a petition to the church or monastery, and so acknowledged the Church as the proper owner (bestower), but begged for the enjoyment of it during his lifetime, with the condition that for each *casata* (each family of the people on the property) one *solidus* (= 12 *denarii*) was to be paid to the church in question. After the death of the holder the benefice falls again to the church, but if necessary and agreeable to the ruler, may again be bestowed (*precarium renovetur et rescribatur novum*). But if there were danger that the church would be impoverished, restora-

tion should ensue. The sovereign retained in his own hands the right of determining how much of such ecclesiastical property was to be given out and to whom. The magnates, it is true, formally received the property from the Church, but on the intercession or command of the prince, and under condition of serving him as vassals. In Neustria, Pippin interfered still more seriously than in these resolutions of Leptinæ, till a certain restriction in the same sense was effected here also. Charlemagne also continued to secularize individual church-properties in this fashion, and wished, in accordance with the desire of the secular magnates, to make the measure universal. Only what was necessary for their support was to be left to the bishops, abbots and abbesses. But meanwhile the ecclesiastical spirit had grown too strong and designated it robbery of the Church, if the laymen who received church-property were thereby to become vassals of the king, and not rather vassals of the bishops and abbots; Charles gave assurances accordingly. On the other hand, the same relationship again developed to the advantage of the property of the Church, inasmuch as, in accordance with the general social development of the age, many free men, in order to share in the enjoyment of the protection of the Church and its privileges, presented their land to the Church, with the purpose of receiving it back again *precario*, i.e. as a benefice. The relation of real dependency which thus arose was not regarded as detrimental to the personal position of the free man.¹

Alongside of innumerable gifts for pious purposes, the above mentioned precarial compacts, as well as the private property of the clergy and monks, which (according to Carolingian regulations, that at least which was acquired after ordination) at their death as a rule fell in to the church or monastery as heirs, **constant sources of ecclesiastical revenue** were formed by the ecclesiastical **tithes**, which, in accordance with the transference of the Old Testament precepts to the Church, were to be raised by all the incumbents of its parishes. Claimed in the Frankish Church since the sixth century, but not enforced, the tithe was established as state-law by Charlemagne, and applied to the profits of personal industry as well as to revenue from the ownership of land. On the other hand **surplice-fees** proper were forbidden, but were replaced by voluntary presents, which became the prevailing custom. The important property of the churches and monasteries necessitated a legal representation of the Church in affairs of property by means of stewards of churches

¹ Even kings received benefices from churches. *Vid.* WAITZ, *Verfassungsgesch.*, II. 2, 234.

and monasteries (*advocati ecclesiæ*). They were frequently the founders, the nobles, on and out of whose properties churches and monasteries were founded; as for the rest, the king exercised this right through his counts, as the *defensores ecclesiæ*, or he appointed stewards to the ecclesiastical foundations or allowed them to make choice of such. These stewards laid claim also to the control of the property of the Church and a share in the revenues, as well as to judicial powers. Hence rights of stewardship were bestowed on the part of the holder as a benefice. Their position was often oppressive to the Church; but Charlemagne universally required of the bishops, abbots and abbesses, that they should have stewards skilful in the law.

The position of the bishops and prelates as a landed aristocracy widened the **breach between the lower and the higher clergy**. In addition it was frequently the case that **serfs** were received into the clergy, a procedure which again was promoted by the emancipation of the clergy from military service. Charlemagne required that no free man should pass into the clergy without special royal permission, hence for the lower grades of the clergy the Church was mainly directed towards the serfs; they are not seldom found even among the higher clergy. Individual synods required emancipation before ordination, but were unable to enforce it.

As regards **ecclesiastical legislation**, the ecclesiastical canons (canons and decretals of councils) were indeed frequently disregarded and violated through the influence of Germanic views; they were now recognised, at least in theory, as the norm for the ordering of ecclesiastical affairs in general. Boniface had already received from Pope Gregory II. a *Codex canonum* (the Dionysiac collection). Similarly Pope HADRIAN sent Charlemagne a complete *Codex canonum*, which is frequently made use of in Charlemagne's capitularies. In the propositions put forward by Charlemagne for the assemblies of the kingdom, or synods, appeal was made, in regard to those points of ecclesiastical order which were in immediate question, to individual canons of the ancient Church, and in Charlemagne's *Admonitio generalis* of the year 789, a whole series of regulations from the older canons are gathered together.¹ At Aix-la-Chapelle, in the year 802, on occasion of a general revision of legislation, a collection of canons was also proposed. But all the individual canonical regulations of the ancient Church were not thereby really brought to life, but their authority was made a support with reference to existing

¹ *Aliqua capitula ex canonicis institutionibus, quæ magis nobis necessaria videbantur, subiunximus.* MG. Capitularia ed. Boretius, I. 53.

necessities, in so far as they did not contradict Frankish conceptions of law.

Under Charlemagne there was completed that development in the Frankish kingdom, in accordance with which both the highest judicial power in ecclesiastical affairs and ecclesiastical **legislation**, the guidance and confirmation of ecclesiastical decisions, became the attribute of the king, who summoned the consultative assemblies of the kingdom, composed of clergy and laity, and who proposed, caused deliberation on, and promulgated the **Capitula**. Hence the chief ecclesiastical legislation is now found in the **capitularies**. Under these circumstances the ecclesiastical hierarchy had indeed a great influence on secular affairs, but was obliged to renounce all purely ecclesiastical legislation. Even the great councils brought about by Boniface were not purely ecclesiastical synods, but so-called *concilia mixta*, in which the magnates of the kingdom took part. Under Charlemagne, alongside of such councils, individual purely ecclesiastical synods are again found, which however are likewise summoned by the king, and whose decisions were by him confirmed. So likewise under Charlemagne, the way is already paved for the separation of the states of the realm into curias. In Charlemagne's procedure, in the zeal with which he devotes himself to ecclesiastical reforms, there everywhere emerges that idea of the **Christian-theocratic kingdom**, which equally contemplates secular and spiritual affairs as problems for the government of the Christian people.

Hence the **relationship to the Pope** also takes a peculiar form. Charles stands on terms of lively intercourse with the Bishops of Rome, acknowledges their primacy and their authority as the guardians of ecclesiastical unity and the tradition of the true faith, and frequently addresses to them inquiries in regard to ecclesiastical legislation and discipline. But he only conceded to them the right of advice, admonition and the like. At the famous **Synod of Frankfort**, Charles himself presided, although papal legates were present, and under his guidance the Frankish Church asserted its dogmatic independence even as against them. It has been noticed, that in the above mentioned *Admonitio generalis* of 789, among the numerous canons adduced, the **Canon of Sardica**, which was intended to afford the foundation of the appeal to Rome, is not included, but the regulations of Nicæa and Antioch are, which ascribe the highest authority to the provincial synod. At the accession of Leo III. to the throne, Charles declared it to be his duty, **externally**, to afford the Church **protection**, **internally**, to **strengthen** it by acknowledgment of the Catholic faith.

CHAPTER TENTH.

Monastic Life.

Sources and Literature: Vid. previous chapter.

As the monasteries supplied the missionaries, so also they formed the fixed points of support in the mission fields, and along with Christianity promoted the cultivation of the soil and the pursuit of the traditional culture. The **Rule of Benedict**, which was favoured by Gregory the Great and others, acquired a growing preponderance over the original local varieties of the monastic life. Even over the peculiar Irish-Scottish form of monasticism, which exercised an important influence on the Frankish Church through Columban's activity, the Benedictine Rule gained the preponderance in the course of the seventh century. With the victory of the Roman Anglo-Saxon system over the Irish-Scottish in England, and with the order introduced by Boniface into Germany, its preponderance is completed. Since the efforts of Cassiodorius, the Benedictines had taken up learned culture, and, since Gregory the Great's Anglo-Saxon mission, they had also taken up the carrying on of missions, in regard to both of which Scottish monasticism had preceded them. The chief churchmen, Willibrord, Boniface and Chrodegang of Metz, promoted the ordering of the monastic life according to the Benedictine Rule. St. Gall already received this Rule under Pippin, and the synods under Charlemagne made it obligatory. At the same time unimportant influences of the Scottish rule were retained.

The social and political position of the so-richly endowed monasteries may be generally inferred from the previous chapter. The so-called **King's monasteries** possessed the **immunity**, either as having been founded by kings and endowed out of crown property, or as founded by private persons, but presented to the king with a view to obtaining the immunity from him. The circumstances depicted above also led to the giving away or granting (*beneficium*) of monasteries to laymen; in consequence of which we find **lay abbots** (*abbato comites, abbates laici, milites*). But it is not laymen only who become **Commendator abbots**, *i.e.* persons to whom the monastery is delivered *in commendam*, but bishops also, partly with the view of

placing young and politically important monasteries under the protection of powerful or trustworthy leaders, partly with a view to procure larger revenues for bishops. The monasteries, each of which was to have its own abbot, as yet form no wider alliance (congregation), even when they are linked together by the somewhat loose bond of a common founder, *e.g.*, in the case of the monasteries of Pirmin's foundation in Bavaria and Alsace. In certain circumstances a larger monastery may also possess a second by presentation (*e.g.* Fulda). The monasteries, as a rule even those provided with the immunity, still stood almost universally under the spiritual supervision and jurisdiction of the bishop, and it was only attempted to protect them against his arbitrary interferences with their financial affairs.

Seeing that the canonical life was recommended to the clergy, and that among the monks, for the sake of mission work, the number of those provided with priestly ordination increased, the view brought the whole body of monks and the clergy near to one another. The monks already sought to force their way into the office of the parochial pastorate, against the opposition of the secular clergy, and the people gladly applied to them in confession.

In the **nunneries** also, which took an important part in the superintendence of ecclesiastical culture, the Benedictine Rule, that of Scholastica, Benedict's spiritual sister, was victorious. Anglo-Saxon nuns followed Boniface to Germany with the most zealous devotion. The best known among them is the Abbess LIoba in **Tauberbischofsheim**, who stood on very close terms of personal intimacy with Boniface. Double monasteries of monks and nuns are also found, under a single administration, which was at first occasioned by the exercise of spiritual functions in the nunneries concerned on the part of those monks who possessed ecclesiastical consecration. Alongside of the monasteries proper there is also found the assumption of the vow of chastity and the nun's robe by persons who remain in their families. It is only regarded as hazardous when such virgins combine in companies without any Rule. Establishments for noble ladies, so-called canonesses, only begin at the close of this period.

CHAPTER ELEVENTH.

The Popular Life of the Church.

As the Franko-Germanic world attains more solid formation, the religious-moral forces of renovation arise from amid the frightful moral barbarism and dissoluteness by means of the Church, and, though in a rude fashion, acquire more solid formation. Permanent foundations for a Christian national education are formed, such as emerge more clearly in Charlemagne's noble creation.

1. The contest with heathen superstition.

Sources: MARTIN of Bracara, *De correctione rusticorum*, ed. Caspari, vid. p. 36. The *Indiculus Superstitionum* (usually brought into connection with the synod of Lestines [p. 78] in the time of Boniface, but by HAUCK, II. 357, with the conversion of the Saxons), *Capit. Franc.*, ed. Boret. p. 222. PSEUDO-AUGUSTINUS, *Homilia de sacrilegiis*, ed. Caspari, Christiania 1886. Cf. also the *Dicta abbatis PIRMINII* in Caspari, *Kirchenhistor. Anecdota*, Christiania 1883, p. 151.

The impression of a new absolute faith in the supramundane Deity and His serious moral claim, and of His immediate entrance into the world for the purpose of redemption from the powers of corruption, His promise of eternal blessedness and His threat of eternal pain, gives men's minds an ideal tendency, and in the midst of the conflicts of rude force, mighty passion and self-seeking, sets awe in presence of a divine, morally exalted power, faith in His miraculous working of salvation, and the feeling of the obligation to obedience, in order to obtain participation therein. But the Church appears throughout as the immediate representative of the divine demands and steward of the divine gifts. The next problem of the Church was to combat the tenacious remnants of the old heathen faith, which now appeared superstition. It is true that the latter in many cases only withdraws into obscurity and continues in great measure to dominate men's minds. It is partly transformed into diabolic spectres, the gods are degraded into spirits and fiends; partly the worship of the saints takes on the character of a metamorphosed heathenism, as well-known and numerous mythological traits were transferred to favourite popular saints. Up to a certain degree the

Church favoured accommodation to usages and popular customs, which were rooted in heathenism, as is already shown in the procedure of Gregory the Great in the Anglo-Saxon mission (*vid. supra*, p. 50). For the rest war is made on every sort of superstition, sooth-saying, magic and sorcery, behind all of which there are seen not mere empty shapes of phantasy, but the action of dark demonic powers, and often enough there is substituted for them a magic-like use of Christian customs, formulas and consecrations.

2. Divine Worship.

Literature : B. Duchesne, *Origine du culte chrétien. Étude sur la Liturgie latine avant Charlemagne*. Par. 1889. Rettberg II. 772.

The **divine worship** of the Church, really understood in its inner significance by comparatively few, impressed the multitude by the solemnity of the function. If in the beginning the **Goths** and **Vandals** possessed not only the Scriptures and preaching, but also the mass, in the Gothic language, the victory of Catholicism over the Arian creed of the Germanic races was also, on the whole, a victory of the Latin language, which, apart from **preaching**, and especially missionary preaching, and **confession**, became and remained the peculiar language of worship, not only among the Franks on Roman soil, but also among the Anglo-Saxons and Teutons. The **Gregorian order of divine worship**, as the **Roman liturgy**, obtained the predominance in spite of important local variations (the Ambrosian in Milan, the Mozarabic in Spain), and became dominant in Germany, through Boniface, and especially Charlemagne. The **Gregorian Latin chant**, brought to England along with the Anglo-Saxon mission, obtained exclusive prevalence in the Frankish kingdom under Pippin and Charlemagne. Charlemagne exerted himself in favour of the cultivation of the **chant** in **monastic schools**, in **Metz**, **Soissons**, and later in **St. Gall**. This chanting exalted the impression made by the solemn mass, in which the multitude, without comprehending the details, were seized by the awe of the mysterious presence of God, and were able to take part by their *kyrie eleison*.¹ The first **organ** came from Greece in the time of Pippin. Then the Emperor Michael Balbus sent one to Charlemagne at Aix; thence organs were naturalized in Germany, naturally at first only in great cathedrals and monastic churches. The older **Latin hymns** were further increased in number by

¹ Charlemagne would also have rescued the Gloria and Sanctus for the congregational singing.

eminent church teachers, Isidore of Seville, Bede, Paul Warnefridi, Theodulf, etc.

The rite of **baptism**, mostly performed in special baptismal churches, was furnished under Charlemagne with all the ceremonies of the Roman Church. In regard also to the **times of baptism** the Carolingian age sought to carry out again the older Roman limitation, and to limit other times of baptism, such as those at Easter and Whitsunday, to exceptional cases. By means of the cultus, the popular mind felt itself to be placed under the protection and consecration of the divine power, and in presence of it religious devotion assumed above all things, the character of **subjection** to the **Church** and of the **performance of religious** service to it; religious fancy, however, was mostly busied with the miracle-working **saints** and **relics**, which latter were regarded as the most necessary requisites for founding churches. In them the saving and protecting Deity approached more closely to childish contemplation, and it not seldom happened, that the legends of these saints, as *e.g.* those of Martin of Tours, assumed familiar mythological traits for the people. The saints partly embody also national opinions and tendencies. Thus S. JAMES led the Spanish Christians to war against the Moors, and in Germany S. MICHAEL led the van.

The **religious duties** which were imposed on the people, consisted in the required participation in the **Eucharist** (three times a year, or at least once, on Thursday in Passion-week), **attendance** on the **churches** or **pilgrimages**, the undertaking of **fasts** as commanded, especially in Lent and the so-called Ember days at the four seasons, finally in the **offerings** and **gifts** to the Church, the alms which blotted out sin and gained religious merit. Donations and foundations take place *in remedium animæ*, to secure salvation. But the **sacrifice of the mass** also comes especially under this point of view of a religious performance, as also the frequent repetition of the **Psalter**. Hence masses are also held for the attainment of definite ends, to a certain extent as enhanced intercessions. LULLUS ordered masses and fasts, in order to obtain good weather; these religious functions, were also to be performed for the advantage of definite persons. The mass, being regarded as the **daily sacrifice for daily sins**, it was at the same time recognized, especially by Gregory the Great, as the means of procuring relief for the **souls of the dead**. Prayer was to be made for the dead in general, at mass, and this gave rise to the special institution of **soul-masses** for definite persons, for which special ecclesiastical foundations were established; but objection was still taken to **low-masses** proper (*missæ solitariae*), at

which the celebrating priest alone, who certainly was not supposed to officiate without an administering assistant, consumed the sacred repast. The object of these **private masses** was served in larger churches by the erection of a considerable number of altars by special foundations, especially as the principle held good, that a priest was only to read **one** mass at **one** altar daily. To what rude conceptions the practice of these masses for the dead led, is shown by an ordinance of the Spanish Church (Concilium Toled. xvii. 5), which interdicts the holding of such masses for the living, in order that they may soon die. A strengthening of the feeling of religious communion and a spiritual insurance is provided by so-called **leagues of the dead**, in which clerical corporations, bishops or abbots mutually secure one another a great number of masses and psalms in case of death. The contrivance first clearly emerges among English monasteries and bishops, with whom Boniface was allied. In the Frankish Church one of the first examples is that of the members of the Synod of Attigny (about 762, according to others 765), who founded a league of the dead of this kind, which obliged all the members to cause a considerable number of masses to be read, and psalms to be sung, on occasion of the death of a brother of the league. Other such leagues of the dead soon arise in Bavaria. The whole Synod of Frankfort in 798 founded a brotherhood of this kind, into which, by Charlemagne's special desire, Alcuin was received. So likewise St. Gall and Reichenau entered into similar alliances.¹

3. The Penitential System.

Sources: in WASSERSCHLEBEN, H. *Die Bussordnungen d. abdt. Kirche*. Halle 1851, and H. J. SCHMITZ, *Die Bussbücher und die Bussdisciplin d. K.* Mainz 1883.—K. HILDEBRAND, *Untersuchungen ü. d. germ. Pönitenzb.* Würzb. 1851. STEITZ, *vid.* i. 258.

The most important instrument for the guidance of believers now consists in measures of **ecclesiastical discipline**, in which, however, the ancient ecclesiastical principles of the **discipline of penance** suffer very essential alterations. The most important is constituted by the fact, that there had been formed since the seventh century the so-called **episcopal synodal courts**, which arose out of the old visitations of churches, but now, especially under Charlemagne, in accordance with the entire spirit of this theocratic kingdom, assumed the character of an **at once political and ecclesiastical institution for the educational discipline** of the people. The bishop, or rather

¹ *Libri confraternitatum S. Galli, Augiensis, etc.* ed. Piper (MG.) 1884.

the archdeacon, is annually to travel over his diocese accompanied by a royal *missus*; seven irreproachable **synodal judges** (*testes synodales*) are then appointed in each community. After the visitation of the clergy by the bishop there follows an inquisition of the laity; the investigation is to extend, besides ecclesiastical transgressions proper, to most of the gross sins, including such as are secularly punishable, especially sexual sins, murder, homicide, robbery, and theft. The ecclesiastical punishment goes alongside of the secular, a matter of so much the more importance considering the facility with which all injury to life and limb could be civilly atoned for by fine. The penance inflicted by the Church as a rule consisted of **fasts** and abstinences, for grave sins, often during a long series of years, also in scourging and imprisonment or excommunication. For the vindication of ecclesiastical authority against persistent obstinacy, use was made of the real, greater excommunication, which on the whole seldom happened, but was supported by the princes. Thus Pippin (775) confirms the law, that such an excommunicated person shall not enter any church, and that no Christian may eat and drink with him or greet him; if he does not seek the reconciliation of the Church, he is banished. But appeal to the metropolitan against the judgment of the bishop was conceded. At the public synodal-courts, in accordance with the ancient penitential system, **public repentance** and confession of sin, and **public reconciliation** were practised in the case of public and notorious sins which had been denounced by the judges. At the same time there was formed alongside of this practice an **ecclesiastical system of confession**, which avoided the **publicity** which encountered great opposition arising from German conceptions; the external signs of penance, cutting off the hair, and the laying aside of weapons, seemed incompatible with the dignity of the free man. The root of this peculiar system of confession lies partly in what had earlier shown itself in the Church of the Empire (i. p. 489), but especially in the pastoral influence exercised by the monasteries, the pædagogical guidance of individual souls. The religious guidance of the converted people by the monasteries, involved the making of this point of view regulative for **the treatment of the lay-world** also, and the attempt was made to place all sins under the pædagogical discipline of the Church. Thus, first in Ireland, and then in England, it became usual to collect definite rules for the imposition of penance for different sins. To this subject belong synodal regulations which are ascribed to Patrick; and again, the much utilized synodal of the Scot VINNAIUS, and those of the Britons DAVID and GILDAS,

of the sixth century. Columba regretted the absence in the Frankish Church of the pastoral discipline of souls by penance, and sought to work in its favour. The book of penance which bears his name at all events points to the influences represented by him, though it remains doubtful whether even a part of it is derived from himself.¹ On the other hand, in the Anglo-Saxon Church it is to THEODORE of Canterbury († 690) in particular that there is traced back the recognition of the principles of penance, which, are given again in the **Pœnitentiale** which bears his name. Public penance does not seem to have been practised at all in the Anglo-Saxon Church in Theodore's time. In the Frankish Church, **private penance** for secret, voluntarily confessed sins comes alongside of the public penance practised by the synodal-courts: "If any one confesses in secret and voluntarily, let him do penance in secret; if, on the contrary, he has been publicly or notoriously convicted, or has so confessed, let it take place publicly and notoriously before the Church according to the known grades of penance."² The newer penitential system, in accordance with its character as taking care of the soul, at the same time directed itself upon **sins of thought**, though mostly without fixing special penitential exercises for such.³ It was then begun, in attachment to the monastic discipline of John Cassian, to lay down the doctrine of the so-called *vitia principalia* (*vid. sup.* i. p. 369), which is made use of in the *Instructiones*⁴ which incorrectly bear Columba's name. The *Pœnitentiale* of Ecbert *e.g.* speaks in this sense of *crimina capitalia*, and Alcuin declares it to be the duty of the priests, to recognize the chief sins and their consequences and to afford men the means of improvement. If there are here, on the one hand, characteristics of the deepening of the penitential system in regard to the care of souls, on the other hand the adjustment of the acts of penance for individual sins shows correspondingly ruder treatment of the matter. With the extension of the penitential discipline to the whole outer and inner life, it now appeared advisable to confess to the priest, but as yet **no proper compulsion to confession existed**; no council as yet ordained that all believers should go annually to confession. On the other hand there is still a very lively consciousness that the duty of confession, in the first place, only consists in the obligation to confess one's sins

¹ Hauck i. 254 would regard Can. 13-37 as the genuine core.

² MGL. I. 395 sqq. Can. 6 of the Synod of Paris in 850.

³ Synod of Châlons (813), can. 32. On the other hand such exercises are actually found in the Penitential of Vinniaus.

⁴ *Vid.* Hauck in ZWL. 1885.

to God, and that it is on this that the real forgiveness of sins, which is God's attribute, depends. The **Synod of Châlons** (*can.* 33), cannot avoid recognizing this, although it also recommends confession to the priest for the sake of *salutare consilium*: "The confession which is rendered to God, takes away sins, but that which takes place to the priest, teaches us, how the sins are taken away;" *i.e.* God in His forgiving grace is not bound to the priestly mediation, but the latter is valuable as a salutary help. Alcuin also had to combat the widespread opinion that confession to the priest was not necessary, in the interest of the priestly care for souls. Correspondingly, the **reconciliation** which was to be completed by the priest, was conceived not as judicial, but only as **deprecatory**. According to the Anglo-Saxon method of procedure, reconciliation was the attribute of the bishop, while penance or offering of atonement might also be imposed by a presbyter or monk. On the other hand, the right of reconciliation is elsewhere ascribed to the presbyter who imposes the degree of penance. According to the original custom, reconciliation was only to take place at the **end** of the period of penance, and accordingly Vinniaus still decides, that a man should not go to the altar till his penance is completely fulfilled. But in the Anglo-Saxon Church at an early period, and in the Frankish Church in the eighth century, restoration was allowed after the elapse of a part of the period of penance.

To the external adjustment of the performance of penance there was attached one of the grossest of all abuses, by the so-called **redemptions of penance**, which were probably at first occasioned by seeking, in the case of weak, sick persons, who had voluntarily confessed their sins, a substitute for the long, burdensome period of fasting, which they were unable to bear in its entire stringency. This method of procedure was essentially promoted by the German legal conception of the so-called *compositions*. In accordance with it, there was an inclination from the very beginning to regard the *pœnitentia* (which indeed as a matter of fact was originally intended to be a satisfaction to the ecclesiastical community, *satisfactio*) as "**compensation**," *i.e.* **amends, indemnification** of the injured. *Jejunare* is placed on an equality with *pœnitere*, as **fasting** in combination with other spiritual exercises forms the chief penitential act. Other amends may take the place of this doing of penance. A **long** period of penance may be replaced by a severe short period (of fasting on bread and water, the repetition of a great number of psalms and prayers, also scourging); but also by a **money-substitute** for a part or even the whole of the period of penance; only the money was to

be devoted to pious ends, the redemption of prisoners and slaves, gifts to the poor, spiritual foundations. But the penitent may also have himself **represented by others**, who take the penances on themselves; and thus a rich man is in a position, if he is not afraid of expense, of working out long years of penance within a few days, by means of paid representatives. The Synod of Cloveshove (747) is still zealous against this abuse, which nevertheless establishes itself. In the Frankish Church also in the time of Charlemagne, decided opposition to this method of procedure is aroused, and in general to the mechanical system which was promoted by the penitentials. The Synod of Châlons will have nothing to do with them, and on the contrary seeks to fall back on the ancient ecclesiastical canons, but without much success.

4. Influence of the Church on legal life.

Ecclesiastical views could only to a small extent penetrate Germanic legal institutions. This is shown *e.g.* in the extensive and peculiar application of the **oath** and so-called compurgators in Germanic judicial procedure, which stood in striking contrast both with Roman views and with those which were represented by the Church. Here the Church only attempted to render conspicuous the religious significance of the oath by connecting it with the Church; it also tolerated the so-called **ordeals** (divine judgment by the lot, by judicial combat, by trial by fire and by water), and only sought to place them under ecclesiastical consecration. As the Church had now marriage, as well as **testamentary affairs**, in its hands, in regard to **divorce** it began the conflict for the principle of the indissolubility of marriage against the Germanic freedom of the man to dismiss the wife with the "morning gift." The following remained valid grounds for divorce: adultery, neglect, banishment, desertion, even leprosy, refusal of the duties of matrimony, and here and there even agreement on account of mutual disinclination is allowed to be a valid ground. The definitions on individual points still wavered multifariously between capitularies, ecclesiastical penitential ordinances and papal decretal letters, and on the whole great laxity prevailed; to a still greater extent extraordinary dissoluteness and disorderliness of life. In the Frankish kingdom, among princes and magnates, sexual alliances of all sorts are formed and dissolved in the most wanton manner, even to the disregard of the principle of monogamy. On the other hand the aims of pious retirement frequently form a motive for the actual dissolution of marriage. Entirely foreign to the Germanic views were the

hindrances to marriage which were asserted by the Church with growing stringency, according to which **blood-relationship to the fourth degree** (by canonical reckoning, which corresponds to the seventh degree according to Roman reckoning) was interdicted. So likewise the hindrance of the so-called **spiritualis cognatio**, such as was assumed to exist between the sponsor and the baptized or his or her parents, subsequently between the sponsors themselves. For the rest, the hindrances to marriage were often made to provide the pretext for the dissolution of marriages which had become burdensome.

5. Preaching and instruction in Penance.

Sources : MÜLLENHOFF u. SCHERER. *Denkmäler deutscher Poesie und Prosa* 2nd ed., Berlin 1873. W. WACKERNAGEL, *Altdutsche Predigten*, Basel 1876, p. 291 sqq. *Literature* : R. CRUEL, *Geschichte der deutschen Predigt im MA.*, Detmold 1879. A. LINSSEN-MAYER, *Gesch. der Predigt in Deutschl.*, München 1886.

Charles sought to exert himself decidedly in favour of the promotion of religious knowledge by **preaching** and **confession**. It is true that the proper means for the Christian education of the people lay partly in civic-ecclesiastical legislation and discipline, partly in habituation to the duties of the cultus, but in regard to both there was required the communication of a certain **religious knowledge**, the importance of which Charlemagne deeply recognised, and which he sought to foster according to his powers. Even under the Anglo-Saxons the planting of Christianity had produced the beginnings of a national literature (poetry), which was able to influence the popular consciousness. Charles's educational efforts (*vid.* following chapter) were consciously directed towards Christian popular education, and at the same time laid the foundation for a national Christian-German literature, as he also applied his attention to the ancient popular songs.

The **missionary preaching**, which was directed to the popular intelligence, had necessarily been obliged to make use of the language of the country, partly directly, partly by the help of interpretation. The Irish GALLUS preached, probably imperfectly enough, in the language of the Alamanni, PIRMIN in *Romance* and German; for the Anglo-Saxons, such as BONIFACE, who is said to have preached to the Frisians in their national language, the matter was facilitated by the cognate nature of the language. **Preaching** proper as a part of the **cultus**, which in general had retired in favour of the liturgical elements of worship, and under the lowered state of culture among the clergy had in many cases become silent alto-

gether, received a new importance in consequence of the missionary activity in the Anglo-Saxon, as also in the German, Church. Charlemagne urged its cultivation, required the regular practice of preaching not only from the bishops, but also from all priests, who were all to be in possession of collections of homilies so that they might draw upon them. The **Homiliarium**, collected by PAULUS DIACONUS at Charles's request, is an anthology of homilies by the Fathers. It has not indeed the general aim of making material for sermons accessible to the clergy, but the special one of assisting the prelection of the Latin so-called *officium nocturnum* on Sundays and Feast-days in monasteries and chapters of cathedrals.¹ But as a matter of fact, where Charlemagne's instigations in the main found observance, it probably was the rule to draw upon extant older homilies (of Augustine, and those which went under his name by Cæsarius of Arles and others, also those of Gregory the Great). The fifteen *sermones* ascribed to Boniface (Ml. 89, 843), the collection of which by Boniface, in spite of Cruel's defence (l.c. p. 40), is subject to very serious doubt (*vid.* H. Hahn in FdG. vol. 24), are in greater part a compilation from patristic homilies. If the Latin language in the Romance region was formerly considerably spread among the Germanic populace also, and latterly the Romance dialects in process of formation still stood pretty close to the Latin, in the German region it was certainly otherwise. But Charles required, in the one case as in the other, what indeed only met with scant performance, that the bishops should exert themselves to translate the homilies into the speech of the people.² The substance of popular sermons in the language of the country, seems, in accordance with Charles's desire (Cap. 789, c. 60, 81), to a large extent to have consisted in catechetical instruction of a very elementary sort, imparting the creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the formulas of confession, with some few explanations and moral doctrines. It was precisely baptism and confession which necessitated the teaching of the people in their own language. Charles requires the Christian people, even under threat of punishment, to know the Lord's Prayer and the confession of faith. Baptismal sponsors must know both and are to teach them to their god-children. Hence we find German translation of the baptismal confession, and of the forms of renunciation to be used at baptism, and of the forms of confession and prayer. Charles's *Encyclica de litteris colendis* of 789 requires the instruction of the people in the creed, Lord's Prayer, and a list of sins composed in

¹ Cruel, l.c. 47 sq.

² *Transferre in rusticam romanam linguam aut theotiscam.*

accordance with Gal. v. 19 sqq. Attempts at translation, such as the Weisenburg Catechism,¹ in part very clumsy translations of the creed, the Lord's Prayer, etc., also fragments of translation of the Bible and other Christian writings and prose translations of Christian hymns, have been preserved.

In 801 and frequently, Charles further enhanced his requirements in this respect. Of his *Exhortatio ad plebem christianam*, which the priests were required to pronounce in Latin word for word and explain in German, a German translation originated in Freising (l.c. No. 54). All of these were very fruitful attempts, to the carrying out of which, however, very much was lacking.

¹ *Vid.* MÜLLENHOFF u. SCHERER. No. 56.

CHAPTER TWELFTH.

The Learned and Theological Culture of the West from Gregory the Great to Charlemagne.

Literature : A. EBERT, *Allg. Gesch. der Lit. im Mittelalter*, I. 516 sqq. II. 3-105.
HAUCK, II. 166 sqq.

WITH the acceptance of Catholicism the Germanic peoples had entered into the literary and theological inheritance of the ancient Church, the fosterers of which were the clergy and the monasteries. At the head stood Gregory the Great, who handed down the ancient Roman-Christian culture to posterity, with a tendency which preponderated towards the practical-ecclesiastical and ascetic. With all his expressed contempt of secular science, which finds its explanation in the inner hollowness of the secular (rhetorical and poetical) culture of the age and in the reproduction of the substance of heathenism, he still stands in the traditional culture, and was regarded by his contemporaries as an esteemed representative of science in general.

In his **Dialogues** (*Dialogi de vita et miraculis patrum italicorum et de æternitate animarum*) he gives an account for the nourishment of faith, partly from the mouth of the people, of the life and miracles of pious men (in the second book, of the life of Benedict of Nursia) and, in the fourth book, for the confirmation of the faith in retribution in the future life, he gives disclosures in accordance with the visions of pious men. These narratives, full of naïve love of the miraculous, in which also the doctrine of purgatory is for the first time searchingly treated, occupied the popular fancy of the people in the most lively manner during the whole of the Middle Ages. His thirty-five books of **Moralia**, dedicated to Bishop Leander of Seville, originating in edificatory expositions of the Book of Job for his monks, lay the foundation for the Middle Ages of the threefold interpretation of Scripture, in accordance with the literal, typical and moral sense, the main point lying in the latter, prolix, spun-out moral disquisitions. His four books, **Regula pastoralis**, on personal conduct and care of souls by the clergy attained an extraordinarily great importance for the instruction of the latter. His numerous letters (*vid supra*, p. 84) are one of the most important sources for the ecclesiastical history of the time. Opp. ed. Maurina, 4 vols. 1705. Ml. 75-79. Monographs by LAU, 1845. PFAHLER I. 1852. BÖHRINGER, vol. 12.

In the times of the lowest state of general intellectual culture, individual men became the guardians of the traditional treasures, not only of theological, but also of the elements of general, literature.

ISIDORE of Seville († 636), the younger brother of Leander, gathered together in encyclopædic fashion, all the learned culture that was accessible in his time.

The twenty books of *Origines seu etymologicæ* treat of grammar, rhetoric, geometry, music and astronomy, medicine, jurisprudence and chronology, further of Biblical and other books, along with what belongs to literary compositions. They treat besides theological, historical, and ethnographical matter, the state and the family, etymologies, anthropology and natural history. Worthy of note, besides, among his historical writings (*Chronicon*, etc.) are the treatise *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (a continuation of the writings of the same name by Jerome and Gennadius), *exegetical* treatises and specially the three books of *Sententiæ*, a compilation of doctrines on faith and morals from the utterances of the Fathers, especially Augustine and Gregory the Great, and his treatise on the *Cultus* (*vid.* i. 520). Opp. ed. Arevalo, Rome 1797, sqq. 7 vols. and Ml. 81—86.

In the Irish-Scottish monasteries also an active literary life early arose, likewise not of a merely theological or biblical sort. Scientific efforts next received a new impulse from the Anglo-Saxon mission, especially from the Greek monk Theodore (of Tarsus), Archbishop of Canterbury (*vid. supra*, p. 53) and his companion HADRIAN. By their means the school of Durovernum, where along with Latin, Greek was also cultivated, attained to great prosperity.

By Columban besides the theological writings (*vid. supra*) we have poetical epistles and Latin hymns and poems in the Antiphonarium of the monastery of Bangor (Muratori, *Anecdota Ambros.* IV. 119 sqq.). Aldhelm, who was educated in the school of Honorius, afterwards in the monastery of Malmesbury (the foundation of a Scot), and who was subsequently Abbot of Malmesbury and finally Bishop of Sherborne (afterwards Salisbury), † 709, in his treatise *De laudibus virginitatis* represents monastic ideas after the model of Cassian, but at the same practises with predilection the art of Latin versification.

BEDE (Bæda), who likewise proceeded from the school of Theodore, embraces in a similar manner to that of Isidore, all the secular knowledge of his time, and furnishes text-books for it. He wrote a *Chronicon* beginning with the creation of the world, the *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* which is of so very extraordinary importance for Church history, biographies of holy men, numerous commentaries which entirely follow the footsteps of the Fathers, and numerous homilies. Opp. ed. Giles, London 1843 sqq., Ml. 90—95. K. WERNER, *Beda der Ehrwürdige*, 1875. The school at York flourished contemporaneously, especially under Archbishop Ecbert and his relation and successor Aelbert. From it proceeded Alcuin; but it had also fertilizing influence abroad, especially on the school of Utrecht, which was connected with the Frisian mission (*vid. sup.*, p. 65).

In **Italy**, even under the Lombards, some connection with ancient Roman culture was maintained, supported by the tradition of the Roman See, relations to the Greek Church and the exertions of Cassiodorus for monastic culture. Hence in the time of Charlemagne, so eminent a representative of ecclesiastical and secular culture as Paulus Diaconus (Warnefridi) could proceed from among the catholicised Lombards.

In the seventh century **Gaul** had stood lowest among all Germanic Christian lands, but it was just from here that there now proceeded the powerful regeneration in connection with the rise of the Pepinids, the expansion and confirmation of the Frankish monarchy, and the activity of Boniface and his Anglo-Saxon companions, and the school of Gregory of Utrecht. As among the Anglo-Saxons, so in Germany also we find nuns taking part to a considerable extent in the fostering of literary culture.¹

CHARLEMAGNE'S exertions in favour of literary culture show themselves especially after his campaign in Italy against the Lombards. He at that time drew to himself the grammarian Petrus Pisanus. PAULUS DIACONUS (Warnefridi), who had betaken himself to the monastery of Monte Casino, was summoned in 782 by Charles to the Frankish court, to the intellectual enlivenment of which he greatly contributed in the following years, till in 787 he again retired to Monte Casino, where he died in 799. Along with his admirable Latinity, his knowledge of Greek and even of some Hebrew elevated him above most of his contemporaries. He also took a strong share in the Latin versification which was soon cultivated with so much predilection in the Carolingian circle. Besides the valuable history of his own people (*Hist. sive de gestis Langobardorum*) he wrote a *Historia episcoporum Mettensium* in the interest of the Carolingian family, and a life of Gregory the Great, and the *Homiliarium* which has been mentioned. (Opp. Ml. 115, *vid.* BETHMANN in the ADG. X. and F. DAHN, *Langobardische Studien*, I., Leipzig 1876.) At the conquest of Friuli Charles had made the acquaintance of PAULINUS, whom he made Patriarch of Aquileia, and who came forward as an ecclesiastical polemic in the Adoptionist Controversy (Opp. Ml. 99). About the same time Charles also made the acquaintance of THEODULF, a man of Gothic descent, whom he subsequently made Bishop of **Orleans**. He took a vigorous part in the poetical efforts of his time, and in subsequent times distinguished himself as a theologian (*vid. inf.*).

At the same time as Paulus Diaconus (782) there came to court

¹ Rettberg, II. 386.

the man who became the soul of all efforts for the promotion of learned and theological culture in the Frankish kingdom. ALCUIN (Alchuine, Latinized into Albinus, Flaccus Albinus, after the fashion in the Carolingian learned circle of designating themselves by classical or even Biblical names), born in York, educated there, and Ælbert's successor as head of the school, in the latter capacity became Archbishop of York. On a journey to Italy he met Charles at Pavia, and in the following year obeyed his summons, accompanied by several other Anglo-Saxons (Wizo, Fredegis, Sigulf). The entire court was attracted into literary zeal by Charles's example. Originally Charles was as good as destitute of any literary culture, even writing he only learned late, but he was now devoted to the elements of the higher culture, Latin, grammar, and the other liberal arts, and on occasion of lively relationships with the Byzantine court made trial of himself in Greek. At the court-school (*schola palatina*) many sons of distinguished Franks received their education from Alcuin, in order to equip them for the service of the Church and the State. At the same time Charles, his family and courtiers, took pleasure in his teaching. Alcuin became the centre of the circle of humanistic excitement, which rejoiced over the attainment of skill in Latin versification¹ and took pleasure in literary correspondence. In 787 Charles commanded all bishops and abbots to erect cathedral and monastic schools, the scientific instruction in which was to have its main object in theology, the exposition of Biblical Scriptures. Subsequently he again repeatedly issued similar exhortations. After Alcuin had again resided in England from 789 to 793, he was permanently gained for the Frankish kingdom, in 796 became Abbot of **Tours**, now lived entirely for the monastic school there and the sciences, and was in constant epistolary correspondence with Charles, till he died in 814.

His extraordinary literary activity extended to every region of contemporary knowledge; he wrote text-books for the liberal arts, numerous poems, among them the poetical history of the archbishopric and school of York, and letters, moral treatises, lives of saints (such as the important life of Willibrord), dogmatic treatises, among which the *Commentarius de fide sanctæ et individue trinitatis* is eminent, as well as controversial writings against Adoptionism and against the Greeks. Opp. ed. Froben 1777, Ml. 100, 101; the letters and historical writings best in Jaffé, BrG. VI. (*Mon. Alcuin.* ed. Wattenbach und Dümmler). K. Werner, *Alcuin* 1876, SICKEL, *Alcuinstudien* 1875.

The SCHOOLS called into existence by Charles's exertions remained,

¹ Insight into the wealth of the Carolingian age in Latin poetry is afforded by the *Poetæ lat. med. æv.* (MG.), ed. Dümmler, 2 vols. 1881 and 84, and vol. 3, ed. Traube 1886.

it is true, on a low level. Charles required reading, writing, counting and singing, grammar and learning of the Psalms, acquaintance with the Gospels and the missal; accordingly it is required of the clergy to be appointed, that they should all understand the Athanasian and Apostles' Creeds and the Lord's Prayer "*cum expositione sua*," that they should know how to handle the Missal, the Exorcism, and the Penitential, that they should understand the gospel and know how to deliver homilies, finally that they should be able to write letters and count. Many of the schools rose higher, to the treatment of the seven liberal arts, the number and rank of which had been brought into acceptance mainly by Augustine (*De ordine libri II.*). The books of MARCIANUS CAPELLA (ca. 460), of BOËTIUS *De Arithmetica* and of CASSIODORIUS *De septem disciplinis*, to which were attached the text-books of ISIDORE, BEDE and ALCUIN, formed the first foundation in the Middle Ages. At these higher schools a few classics and church-fathers were also read; canon law and the Holy Scriptures were the main subjects of concern. Many of them also occupied themselves with the study of **Greek**, for the cultivation of which opportunity was given in the political relations of Charles with the Byzantine court.

CHAPTER THIRTEENTH.

The Participation of the Frankish Church in the Movements of Theology.

AMID the educational efforts of the Carolingian age, the Church, although moving quite prevailingly in traditional theological grooves, gains an exalted self-confidence. The representatives of the Church find opportunity of taking their place in ecclesiastical controversies on various points.

1. The Image-Controversy.

Sources : **Codex Carolinus**, ep. 36, 37, (20, 26) in Jaffé, BrG. IV. (Mon. Carol.), Berlin 1867. **Libri Carolini**, ed. Tilius, Paris 1549 and in GOLDAST, *Imperialia decreta* and ejdm. *Collectio Constitutionum imperialium* (vid. sup. p. 13) MI. 98 and better in HEUMANN, *Augusta Nicæni consilii censura*. Hannover 1731. Cf. Jaffé, BrG. VI. (Mon. Alc.), p. 220 sqq. *Hadriani I. papæ ad Carolum regem de imaginibus*, ibid. p. 245 (Jaffé 2483) ; Synod of Frankfort 794.

During the Byzantine image-controversy, Pippin, on the inducement of the Emperor Constantine Copronymus, caused the Frankish Church to enter into discussion concerning this question and also concerning the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit, for the first time probably at the synod at Gentiliacum (767 sqq.). Pope Paul I. assured Pippin of his contentment with what was there expressed. The Acts of the II. Nicene Council (787), having reached Charlemagne in a somewhat faulty translation from Constantinople, gave Charles and the Frankish Church an opportunity of vindicating the opposition to the Byzantine Empire in a very animated manner. First of all Charles sent the Synodal-book to King Offa in England. Here, with the essential participation of ALCUIN a refutation was composed, which the latter himself brought to Charles by commission of the English princes and bishops. On this as basis, there arose a memorial of Charles, *i.e.* of his theologians, in the composition of which, the Arch-chaplain Angilbert, who brought it to Rome, seems also to have shared. The relationship of this "capitula" of Charles to the famous **Libri Carolini** is not quite clear, as, while they are in the closest contact as regards essentials,

the arrangement and substance seem to have differed. The Caroline Books declare themselves both against the earlier iconoclast synods and against the II. Nicene held under Irene's influence, and give a very contemptuous judgment on the arbitrary scriptural exegesis of the latter and the arrogance of the Greeks, as against which a strong self-confidence finds utterance. They reject the fanaticism of the iconoclasts, seeing that images may well serve for the adornment of churches and *in memoriam rerum gestarum*, but pronounce much more decidedly against the image-worshippers, in regard to whom, not without the fault of the bad Latin translation, they pass over unnoticed the distinction between *λατρεία* and *προσκύνησις* made by the II. Nicene Synod. They deny the necessity of images for the maintenance of the remembrance of sacred things; their use decides nothing for or against the faith. God alone is to be **worshipped** (*colendus*), and, along with him, his saints are to be **venerated** (*venerandi*). The *adoratio* of images is to be rejected, for while the educated are able to maintain the distinction between the image and the person it portrays to whom veneration is due, the common man is not: "Therefore we will have no *adoratio* (*i.e.* no bowing), no lighting of candles and offering of incense before images, and no kissing of them." The books animadvert upon the lack of Biblical foundation for the service of images. Images are not to be venerated like the saints, not even like eminent living men, nor like the relics, which were so important for the popular consciousness of the West, in the case of which the relationship to the divinely glorified living personalities exalts the believing consciousness. Nor might the veneration due to dead images be compared to that due to the Bible, or the elements of the Supper, the Cross, the sacred vessels and the Church itself. The Cæsarolatry of the Greeks, who seek to justify the veneration of images by the *προσκύνησις* before the busts of the emperors, is bitterly censured. Bitter remarks are also let fall against the presidency of a woman (Irene) over the Nicene Synod.

Hadrian's reply to the Capitula sent by Charles extols the authority of the Apostolic see, and in the form of a corrective reply adheres to the fact, that his predecessors at synods had condemned those who would not venerate (*venerari*) the sacred images of the Lord Christ, His mother and all saints, according to the doctrine of the Fathers; he adopts the Second Nicene Synod, without desiring to defend every word there uttered. But the discussion goes so slightly into the matter, that one might conjecture an intentional avoidance of the controversy. At the Synod of **Frankfort** in 794,

although papal legates were present, the repudiation of the Seventh Œcumenical Synod was maintained. It was charged with claiming *servitium et adorationem* for the images of the saints, equally with the Divine Trinity, an assertion which certainly does injustice to that synod. Later still the Frankish Church (Synod of Paris in 825), not misled by the authority of the Pope, maintained its position on the question.

2. The Controversy on the Procession of the Holy Spirit.

In accordance with the Trinitarian development of doctrine in the Greek Church (i. 402), it was confessed in the Creed, **that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father**, on the other hand, the Western (Augustinian) conception had led to the assertion **that the Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son**. This form of doctrine we find in the so-called **Athanasian Creed** (also called from its initial word the *Quicumque*), which formulates the ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity in the fashion influenced by Augustine, probably in opposition to the Arianism of the Germanic peoples. The unknown author designates this confession Athanasian after the father of orthodoxy. Cæsarius of Arles (i. 468) is the first to show acquaintance with its forms. At the Third Toledan Council (589 *vid.* Reccared's conversion, p. 40), the addition **filioque** appears in the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Confession there adopted, and the denial of the doctrine that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from the Son and is of the same nature with the Father and the Son, is condemned. Similarly we find the addition *filioque* in the Spanish synods of the seventh century. Maximus Confessor mentions that the Greeks (then Monotheletic) found fault with this doctrine to Pope Martin. At the Synod of **Gentiliacum** (p. 129), as has been noticed, the difference again came under discussion. In the West there is almost uniformity as to the justification of the *filioque*, i.e. of this doctrine in itself. The Caroline Books decidedly champion it; scruples were only excited by its admission into the long consecrated wording of the Creed, which was now attempted in the Frankish Church also. At the Synod of **Friuli** (Forum Juliense, 796) Paulinus of Aquileia did indeed provide against alterations or additions to the Creed, so far as they altered the sense, which however he denied in regard to the *filioque*. As the Second Œcumenical Council of Constantinople (381) by its additions to the confession of the Holy Spirit had only explained the confession of the Nicene Fathers in accordance with the meaning and against heretical doctrine, the same held good of the addition *et a filio*. Alcuin had

already expressed himself in favour of the Western style in the treatise *De processione spiritus sancti*. When Latin monks belonging to Jerusalem, after their return from the West, sang the creed with the addition, as they had heard it in the West under Charles, they were vigorously blamed by the Greeks and applied to Pope Leo III., appealing to the Frankish practice. On the Pope's communication Charles commissioned THEODULF of Orleans with the preparation of a dogmatic treatise in vindication (*De spiritu Sancto*), and the Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle in 809 pronounced in favour of the Western doctrine. In consequence of this Leo III. in 810 expressly approved of the Western doctrine, but censured the fact that the *filioque* was expressly interpolated in the Frankish Church, and so sung at mass. According to the *Liber Pontificalis* Leo is also said to have had the Creed engraved on two silver tables in S. Peter's, according to the long-consecrated wording (*i.e.* without the *filioque*).

3. The Adoptionist Controversy.

Sources: ELIPANDI *epistola ad Albinum* and *ad Felicem* in Ml. 96, 868 and in Jaffé *Monum. Alcuin.* 494 sqq.—ETHERII UXAMENSIS et BEATI presbyteri *adversus Elipandum libri II.* in J. Basnage (Canisii) *Monumenta* II. 279 (Ml. 96).—ALCUIN's writings against Felix and various letters and other documents in Alcuin's opp. ed. Froben 1777 (Ml. 100 and 101), the Alcuin letters also in Jaffé, l.c.—The treatise of PAULINUS of Aquileia in opp. ed. Madrisius 1737 (Ml. 99). AGOBART of Lyons opp. ed. Bazulius 1666, Ml. 104. The synodal negotiations in Mansi XIII. Hadrian's letter to the Spanish bishops in Jaffé, BrG. IV. (*Mon. Carol.* 292).—WALCH, *Ketzerhistorie* IX. HEFELE, *Conciliengesch.* III. HELFERICH (*vid.* p. 36). HAUCK, II. 1, 250. GRÖSSLER in the *Jahresb. d. kgl. Gymn. z. Eisleben* 1879. Abel-Simson *Jbb. d. fränk. Reichs unter Karl*, II. 29 sqq., 67 sqq., 154 sqq. A. HARNACK, DG. III. 248 sqq.

This controversy is occasioned by relations of the Frankish Church to the Spanish under Saracen rule. Its outward adjustment arose out of the subjection of the Basques and the beginning of the formation of the Spanish Mark with the cities of Urgelli (La Seo de Urgel) and Girona (from 780), which events were associated with the establishment of the Aquitanian kingdom for Charles's then three-year-old son Lewis; it also arose out of connections with Christian Asturia, where Alphonso II. (from 784) had to guard against the usurper Maurecat who was favoured by the Saracens, while the Asturian Church, with its metropolitan see of Braga, opposed and repudiated the claims of the Archbishop of Toledo who was under Saracen rule.

Against the heretical views of a certain MIGETIUS, especially against his doctrine of the Trinity, Archbishop ELIPANDUS of Toledo had successfully striven, and an emissary of the Roman Bishop Hadrian I., Bishop EGILA, who was to have worked in Spain in the interest of Rome, was so compromised by his alliance with Migetius, that the Bishop of Rome was obliged to let him drop.

In the conflict with Migetius, Elipandus had been led to give great prominence in the person of Christ to the distinction between the eternal Son of God and His human appearance. The presbyter BEATUS of Libana and his younger friend and disciple Bishop ETHERIUS of Othma (both in the Christian-Asturian district), now attacked the doctrine of the Toledan, who on being so informed, expressed himself violently against them in the letter to an Abbot Fidelis. According to an older expression, which also occurred in the Spanish Liturgy, of the incarnation of Christ as an **adoption** of man, *i.e.* of human nature or the flesh, Elipandus designated Christ a son by nature only in His divine nature; according to His human nature, on the other hand, He was a son by adoption (*filius Dei non genere, sed adoptione, non natura, sed gratia*, and even *nuncupative Deus*). According to His divine nature Christ was *unigenitus*, according to the human *primogenitus in adoptione*; but in saying this he did not go so far as to mean to deny the unity of the divine-human person of Christ. His opponents regarded this as a revival of the Nestorian doctrine; in His human nature also Christ was the true and real Son of God, since it had been fully appropriated by the personal Son of God. In Asturia the opponents of Elipandus had the king and the Archbishop of Braga on their side; for the rest, violent dissension prevailed, probably not unconnected with the opposition of the political parties. When Bishop FELIX of Urgel, a very skilful and theologically important champion, took the side of Elipandus, the Aquitanian-Frankish Church was also drawn into the controversy. Hadrian I. had already declared against Adoptionism; the **Synod of Regensburg** (792) in the presence and under the presidency of Charles now compelled Felix to retract. He had to abjure his doctrine in Rome before Hadrian. Returning home, he again threw off the enforced confession, fled to Saracen territory and continued the controversy. ELIPANDUS and his party now applied to Charles and the Franko-German bishops with representations, and craved the former, that he would reinstate Felix in his episcopal office. In consequence, however, the Frankfort assembly of 794 once more rejected Adoptionism. This synod, in its association with Charlemagne, appeared as the centre of the whole Christian West. Charles had already repeatedly placed himself in alliance with the Pope, and obtained from him a declaration against the erroneous doctrine. He now sent a declaration obtained from the Pope by request, that of the bishops of Upper Italy composed by Paulinus of Aquileia (*Libellus sacrosyllabus*) and that of the Gallican and German bishops, in which Anglo-Saxons had also

a share, to Elipandus, on whom he also impressed that he might trifle away the help of the Frankish power against the Saracens by his doctrinal attitude. This was followed by a lively literary attack, especially by ALCUIN and PAULINUS of Aquileia. By the help of Paulinus and others Alcuin laid his *Libellus adversus Felicis hæresin* before Charles for examination. To this there was subsequently attached the larger work: seven books *Adversus Felicem*. In October 799 Elipandus sent his vehement treatise through Felix to Alcuin, which was however to fall first into the hands of Charles. With a view to opposing the very wide-spread false doctrine, Adoptionism was repudiated by Leo III. at a Roman synod, on the suggestion of Charles (end of 799 or beginning of 800).¹ Felix was threatened with condemnation if he would not retract. Bishop Leidrad of Lyons obtained in Urgel, where Felix must have again settled, in return for Charles's promise of a free hearing before the bishops, his sworn promise to appear. At Aix-la-Chapelle (June 800; others say already in 799), in the royal palace, Alcuin long disputed with Felix, who finally declared himself overcome. Felix invited the clergy of the Urgellitan Church to follow him, and was received into the peace of the Church; but he might not return to his episcopal seat, but was obliged to close his days at Lyons under the eye of Leidrad, and after his death, of Agobard. Even now, however, he seems to have cherished his divergent opinions and made them known. Leidrad, supported by Nefried of Narbonne and the famous Abbot Benedict of Aniane, now wrought successfully for the quieting of the excited Church of Septimania. They are said within a short time to have converted 20,000 souls. Outside the sphere of the Frankish Church and power Elipandus remained unshaken, but the controversy was bit by bit extinguished. Apart from the unrest which was naturally involved in the ecclesiastical doctrine of the two natures and its contradictory definitions, the controversy was perhaps influenced by the old Antiochene tendency, through Oriental Christians who had come to Spain in the train of the Arabs.

¹ HEFELE III. 722, indeed judges otherwise, and dates it as early as 798.

SECOND PERIOD.

FROM CHARLEMAGNE TO THE MIDDLE OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.

Survey of the General Condition of the World.

THE Christian world had now two great centres, the ancient Byzantium and the new creation of Charlemagne, which the Byzantine Empire, in spite of all its œcumenical claims, was obliged to recognize as of equal rank.¹ In the Eastern Empire we see a state system resting on ancient Roman-Christian traditions, which indeed in its Western dominion is limited to a quite small remnant by the Frankish power in Italy and the Arab power in Spain, and in the East is entirely deprived of great provinces by Islam, and which besides, in the period of the assaults on images, has to undergo grave internal shocks, but in spite of all that revealed for future times a very firm structure and a tenacious power of life. With the developed mechanism of its political and ecclesiastical order, with its art of war and maritime capacity, the wealth of its world trade and its ancient possession of higher civilization, it survived frightful storms in the period under discussion. The Arab Caliphate of Bagdad, which under Harun al Raschid claimed and received its tribute from Byzantium, did indeed more and more lose its terror, but in place of it the independent Mohammedan domains on the Mediterranean began to make themselves objects of fear.²

On the other hand, the influx of Slav races from the north into the Balkan peninsula had already brought the gravest dangers. The **Bulgarians**, who in 680 had already crossed the Danube and thronged into Mœsia, now made themselves objects of fear. Against their Khan KRUM the Emperor Nicephorus I. lost his life in 811. Under Boris's son SYMEON (888-927), who twice besieged the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus in Constantinople, the Bulgarian kingdom attained its greatest expansion, and Byzantium like Servia had to pay tribute. It was only under Emperor Johannes TZIMISCES (971) and after continued frightful wars, especially under BASILIUS II. (the butcher of the Bulgarians) that this fearful foe was successfully subjected. In addition there were the Chazars, Patzinaks, and Russians beyond the Black Sea, besides the independent Southern Slavs, Serbs and Magyars. But these very facts opened new and great problems of Christian civilization, such as the Græcising and Christianising of the Slav populace which had thronged into the Empire, the conversion of the Bulgarians, the free Slavs and the Russians. Amid all these storms the firm structure of the Byzantine political system was proved by trial, and the Empire also survived the internal shocks, frequent palace and

¹ In the peace of the Emperor Nicephorus with Charles in 803, the former tacitly but finally gave up the Greek claims on Rome and Central Italy, and in the peace of 812 the ambassadors of the Emperor Michael also greeted the lord of the West as βασιλεὺς, *vid.* ABEL-SIMSON, *Jbb.* II. 482.

² Loss of Crete in 823; settlement of the Arabs in Sicily, 827; fall of Syracuse, 878, etc. Loss of the remains of Greek dominion in Spain.

military revolutions which accompanied the growth of absolutist despotism. With the powerful and astute upstart **BASIL I.** the **MACEDONIAN** (867-886) the so-called **Macedonian Dynasty** came to the front, the first representatives of which after Basil (like himself and Cæsar Bardas before him) are of outstanding importance for the fostering of the accepted Greek culture and science; they have much less importance in their character as rulers. These were **LEO VI.** the **PHILOSOPHER** (886-912) and **CONSTANTINE VII. PORPHYROGENITUS** (945-959), who attained the throne when seven years old, but only obtained governing power after the fall of **ROMANUS LEPAKENUS** and his sons. Under the youthful **ROMANUS II.** (959-963), who lived only for pleasure, Byzantine military capacity obtained the re-conquest of Crete by **NICEPHORUS PHOCAS**, who was raised to the throne by **THEOPHANO**, the widow of Romanus, as **NICEPHORUS II.** († 969). In him and his successor, **JOHANNES TZIMISCES** († 976) the Empire found two capable soldiers and powerful men, and **BASIL II.** (976-1025) broke the power of the Bulgarian Khan **SAMUEL** with terrible energy, restored the authority of the Empire in the north as far as the Save and Raab and received the homage of the Serbs and Croats. Under him the Eastern Empire stood forth in inherited and asserted glory, involuntarily regarded by the surrounding peoples, not only of the East and North, but also by those of the Germano-Roman West, as the centre of the civilized world. From this time onwards the close of the Macedonian Dynasty, until the rise of the first Comneni, exhibits undignified feminine rule. However, the revolt of the Serbs and Bulgarians (1040) which gravely threatened the Empire was fortunately quelled. But alongside of the attack of the **Russians** and **Patzinaks** and the menacing settlement of the **Normans** in the West (Southern Italy), a new and dangerous enemy appears in the East, the **Seljuk Turks**, who entered into the inheritance of the Caliphate. In regard to ecclesiastical matters, the momentous break with Rome is completed in 1054 under **CONSTANTINE IX. MONOMACHUS**, the last husband of the Princess Zoë.

In the **West** the Christian Frank kingdom had reached its highest point under Charlemagne; the present period at first shows a fading of the brilliant picture of the Christian Imperium. But the foundations of Christian civilization which were laid still show themselves powerful in resistance and rich in seed for the development of the future, and save themselves even amid the enfeeblement and partition of the kingdom. The sundering of the parts of the Frankish monarchy (treaty of **Verdun** 843, of **Mersen** 870) renders possible a national development of Germany as well as France, but has also the effect of loosening the authority of the hierarchical Church which, on the whole, was harmoniously fitted into Charles's kingdom, but now vindicates itself as the **universal and encroaching power of the papacy**, while at the same time this papacy which has become so arrogant is sacrificed to the emancipated local powers of **Italy**. Besides, the coasts of the Mediterranean are severely afflicted by the scourge of the Arab corsairs. In **England** the Anglo-Saxon rule attains to comprehensive unity in **ECBERT** in 827, but the invasions of the **Danes** now begin. Though **Alfred**, by the amalgamation of the Danes with the Anglo-Saxons, was able to secure independence to his kingdom and increased prosperity to Anglo-Saxon civilization for another hundred years, the power of the **Danes**, which had become too strong, finally obtained dominance (1016-1042), and in the end the restored Anglo-Saxon Dynasty is overthrown by the **Normans** under **WILLIAM I.** In **France**, which had had to suffer from the invasions of the Normans since the second half of the ninth century, the monarchy under the last Carolingians rested almost entirely on its nominal superiority over the great vassals. But

the new race of the **Capets**, which emerged in the tenth century, maintained the conception of the French monarchy. The Germanic element of Northern France received strong support from the settlement of the Normans, as against the Roman character of Southern France. While the difference in language and civilization between the North and South remained, the way was paved for national and political unity, especially by the influence of the Church, which did essential work for the confirmation of internal peace and the promotion of culture. At the close of this period the beginnings of the spirit of **knighthood** already show themselves, and the beginning also of a **free bourgeoisie**, to which the cities of the South with their ancient Roman reminiscences contributed, but in Northern France the combination of the free inhabitants of the low country into communes within the walls of the cities. From Germany there now begins the conflict with the **Scandinavian North**, and here also, as towards the **Slavonic East**, the greatest Christian problems of civilization arise, which after the efforts of the ninth century (Lewis the German), in the tenth are brought nearer to their solution by the united **German Empire** which was raised out of the decay of the last Carolingian times by the Saxon kings **HENRY** and **OTTO**. On the other hand in the weakness of the monarchy in France and the confusion in Italy, **Otto I.** comes forward as the establisher of order and peace, acquires the **emperorship** and the **protectorate over the papacy** it involved, which he asserted in the sense of Charlemagne, with the object of raising it from a state of deep depression. The Diet of **Quedlimbourg** in 973, where **Miesko** from Poland, **Boleslav** from Bohemia, and ambassadors of the Romans, Greeks, Hungarians, Danes, Slavs, Bulgarians and Russians appeared, afforded a representation of the universal importance of the Saxon empire for the Christian world and the world which was being opened to Christianity. It is true that the frightful revolt of the Slavs on the eastern frontier soon destroyed **Otto's** creation, and in Italy the Papacy once more sank into the most unbridled disorder, but the advances of Christianity in the north and east opened wide prospects, which gladdened the Empire and Papacy which were allied in the persons of **OTTO III.** and **SYLVESTER**. Under **Henry II.** and the **Salic Conrad II.**, who brought Burgundy to the Empire, and under **Henry III.**, the authority of the Empire and its dominion over Italy were maintained, and the influence of German policy on the Slavs, Poles, Bohemians and Hungarians who were being added to the Christian world, was strengthened. **Henry III.** was able once more to employ German influence successfully in rescuing the Papacy from deep disgrace.

CHAPTER FIRST.

The Spread of Christianity.

1. The Northern Mission.

Sources: ADAMI *gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesie pontificum* rec. Lappenberg, ed. altera, Hannover 1876 (MGS. VII.).—RIMBERTI *vita Anskarii, accedit vita Rimberti*, rec. G. WAITZ. Hannover 1884 (MGS. II.). KOPPMANN, *Die ältesten Urkunden des Erzbisthums Hamburg-Bremen*, Hamburg 1866 (Gött. Inaug. Diss.).—*Literature*: E. PONTOPPIDAN, *Annales ecclesie Danie*, 4 vols. 1741. MÜNTER, *Kirchengeschichte von Dänemark und Norwegen*, 1823. DEHIO, *Geschichte des Erzbisthums Hamburg-Bremen*, Berlin 1875. MAURER, *Die Bekehrung des norwegischen Stammes zum Christenthum*, München 1856.

A REACTION on their ancient home of the Anglo-Saxons who were converted in Britain, is at first not demonstrable; nor did Willibrord's Frisian mission (*vid.* p. 65) leave behind it any trace of influence on his North-Frisian congeners of the western islands and the west coast. It was the subjection of the Saxons by Charlemagne and the foundation of the North-Saxon bishoprics of Bremen and Verden which first laid the foundation for the conversion of **North-Albingian Saxony** between the Elbe and the Eider, as also of the **Scandinavian North** in general. After overcoming the resistance which was specially tenacious in the North of Saxony on both sides of the Elbe, Charles in 804 caused 100,000 inhabitants, with women and children, to be carried away from the Gau of Wigmodi (left of the Elbe, the Bremen district) and from North Albingia, and made room in their district for the Slavonic **Obotrites**, who, pressing in from Mecklenburg, had settled in the eastern part of the modern Holstein (Wagria), and under TASKO or TRASIKO had beaten the "Northmen" on the field of Sventine in 798. So far as they held Holstein, it remained closed to Christianity in the outset. The conflicts between the Danes under Göttrik (Gottfried) gave Charles occasion to interfere. After Göttrik's death he concluded peace with the Danes under Hemming in 810. The North Albingians who had been carried away were partly allowed to return. The frontier mark between the Eider (North Eider or Treene) and the Schlei seems to have been established for the fortification of the Empire against the Danes;¹ probably at that time also the frontier mark against the Wends, the so-called *limes Saxonicus*, a narrow strip from the Elbe to the Bay of Kiel. Two fortresses dominate the land, Hobeuoki (Höbek near Gartow) on the Elbe, and Esseveldoburg (Itzehoe).

The first ecclesiastical centres beyond the Elbe are **Hamburg**, where Charles about 805 caused a church to be consecrated by

¹ This hypothesis has been again taken under protection by Dehio in opposition to Koppmann's doubt; cf. also WAITZ, *Jbb. d. d. R. unter Heinrich I.* 3, p. 279.

Archbishop Amalharius of Trèves, which was entrusted to the priest HERIDAG, and **Meldorf** in Dithmarschen. The latter came under Bremen, the former under Verden. Conflicts in Jutland under GÖTTRIK's sons and HARALD (Heriold), son of Halfdan, temporarily drove the latter out of the country. At the imperial court at Aix-la-Chapelle he commended himself (in 814) as *vassus*, according to Frankish custom, into the hands of the Emperor LEWIS. When after a few years he returned with German assistance, and was conceded a share in the government by the sons of Göttrik, Archbishop Ebo of Rheims was sent to Rome by an assembly of the Empire, with a view to being commissioned by Pope Paschal I. with the mission among the peoples of the North.¹ Bishop Willerich of Bremen went with him to the Danes in Jutland, where Ebo baptized many. From Lewis the Pious he received the manor of **Welanao**, the modern **Münsterdorf**, on the Stör, under the protection of the castle of Itzehoe, as a point of support for his activity. Again expelled by his opponents, Harald fled in Ebo's retinue once more to Lewis, and on St. John's Day, 826, in the chapel of St. Alban, in Mayence, was solemnly baptized with his wife and sons, when the Imperial family itself supplied the place of god-parents to them. His whole following imitated his example. About the same time Göttrik's sons had concluded peace with Lewis.

For the new field which was now opening there was wanted a personality entirely devoted to missionary service, and the then very powerful Abbot WALA of Corbie found it in one of his monks, ANSGAR (or ANSKAR = God's spear). He was born in 801, brought up and educated, after the death of his mother, in the monastery at Corbie (on the Somme above Amiens in Picardy), under ADALHARDT, the cousin of the Emperor Charles, then transplanted to the branch foundation Corvey on the Weser (Neu-Corbie). Serious ascetic strictness and a piety which was receptive of voices and visions from the higher world, was early aroused in the boy, quite in the spirit of the age, but of great purity and fervour. Ansgar, along with the monk AUTPERT, accompanied King Harald in 826 on his return journey, which went down the Rhine by Cologne and Duurstede, the important Frisian place in active commercial intercourse with the Scandinavian North, as far as the Jute frontier. Here they worked in the neighbourhood of the king in Hethabye (*i.e.* Sleswick),² but had soon to follow the re-expelled king to the

¹ Bishop Halitgar of Cambrai was to accompany him. Nothing however is known of his activity.

² It is incorrect that a church had already arisen at Sleswick.

Frisian fief (Rüstringen on the Weser) conferred on him by Lewis. They exerted themselves, living now among heathens and again among Christians, to give heathen boys Christian education. Autpert, however, was obliged by illness to return to Corvey, where he died in 829.

When an embassy from **Sweden** appeared at the court of Lewis, begging for Christian preaching, Ansgar, whose place with Harald was now taken by Gislemar, was sent in the year 830 along with the monk WITTMAR of Corvey to Sweden, fell on the way into the hands of Norman pirates, but succeeded in reaching **Birka** on Lake Maelar, the chief harbour of the country, where the Burggraf allowed himself to be baptized and built a church. After a year and a half Ansgar returned to Lewis, and, on the conclusion of peace with King Horich, the son of Göttrik, at Diedenhofen in the summer of 831, was consecrated **Bishop of North-Albingian Saxony** in November, 831, by the half-brother of Emperor Lewis, Bishop DROGO of Metz, with the assistance of the most eminent ecclesiastical dignitaries, including Ebo, Hettis of Trèves, Olgar of Mayence, with the approbation of the bishops of Bremen and Verden. In this way there was founded the bishopric of Hamburg, to which the few Transalbingian ecclesiastical foundations belonging to Verden and Bremen had to be given up again. The Elbe, but with inclusion of the moor and marsh-land on its south bank, was to form the southern limit. But the Bishop of Hamburg was to become archbishop of a diocese of the North which was still to win by mission-work. Ansgar personally obtained confirmation in Rome from GREGORY IV. and at the same time his appointment as **Apostolic Vicar** or personal delegate of the Pope for the North in general. Ebo having received fundamentally similar qualifications, affairs were so arranged, that he assumed the Swedish mission, and for this purpose commissioned his nephew Gauzbert as Bishop of Sweden (under the name of Simon); but after a few years Ebo was again driven away, while his nephew suffered a martyr's death.

Ansgar's position in Hamburg was limited and necessitous. To the existing churches in Hamburg and Meldorf, Heiligenstätten and Schenefeld and perhaps a few chapels were added. In these four chief churches of the country baptisms were performed at Easter and Whitsunday. Monks from Altecorvey occupied a monastery in Hamburg, where serfs (purchased boys) were brought up as Christians. Ansgar had the same thing done in the monastery (cell) of Turholt in Flanders, which was assigned to him for his support by Lewis. But after Lewis's death, in the partition of Verdun, it fell

to Charles the Bald, who bestowed the monastery elsewhere, so that the school ceased, and the boys were placed among the serfs of the new proprietor. In addition there came the severe blow of the sudden attack and complete destruction of Hamburg by the **Normans** in 845 (not 842). Although King Horich had renewed the peace with the Frankish Empire in 839, hostilities against all the three Frankish kingdoms began soon thereafter. Almost contemporaneously there ensued the piratical expedition of the Normans into France, which brought them as far as before Paris, an invasion of Christian Friesland and the above-mentioned devastation of Hamburg. Ansgar only saved his bare life and the sacred relics, and church and monastery went up in flames. Lewis the German now made Ansgar Bishop of Bremen, just vacant, the bishoprics of Hamburg and Bremen being thus united. Verden, which now laid claim again to the parts of North Albingia which had formerly been relinquished to Hamburg, received instead a portion of the diocese of Bremen on the left bank of the Elbe. The relative negotiations were carried on at the Synod of Mayence in 847 and 848. The new archbishopric of Bremen-Hamburg had now to seek release for Bremen from its previous suffragan position under Cologne, which Günther of Cologne conceded in 862 and Pope Nicholas confirmed in 864.

After the sudden attack on Hamburg, Lewis the German demanded satisfaction from Horich, and the pestilence, which was brought into Denmark from France by the Normans, and which was regarded as the power of the saints and the Christian God, made an impression. Ansgar entered into friendly relations with King Horich, and the man, who was honoured by the people as a prophet of God and miracle-worker, produced the most powerful effect on rude minds by his word, was untiring in alms-giving, but for himself only coveted one miracle, that God would make of him a good man, and also, in his capacity as the commissioner of Lewis the German, instilled into the King great confidence in his trustworthiness and honesty. Ansgar was now able to found a church in the important **Sliasvig**, an emporium of the trade of the time, whither merchants from all quarters resorted and where there were already Christians, who were baptized in Hamburg or Dürstede. It is true that Horich was then overthrown and the Christian priests driven away, but the young king, Horich (Erich) II. expelled the chief opponent, Jarl Hovi of Sleswick. Ansgar returned, and in Ripe also a church arose in 856.

In **Sweden**, as Gauzbert, now Bishop of Osnabrück, would not

again take up the work of the mission, Ansgar himself had gone to King Olaf in 852, and made Grimbert, a nephew of Gauzbert's, priest in Birka, and the Folk-thing there had declared by a majority for toleration of Christianity. In the year 865 Ansgar ended his life of many deeds, which amid all the pressure of action maintained its contemplativeness and monastic asceticism to the end.¹

His pupil and biographer RIMBERT succeeded him, and for twenty-three years administered the archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen, untiringly active also in journeys to Denmark and Sweden. But the unsettled life and the warlike undertakings of the Danish sea-king in the second half of the ninth century did not permit of the idea of further mission work, and even smothered what had already been planted in North-Albingian Saxony. The churches in Ripe and Sleswick were destroyed, and Rimbert had also to experience the terrible defeat of the Saxons by the Danes on the 2nd February, 880. About this time the Saxon Mark (*Limes Saxonicus*) seems also to have been lost. The missionary activity of the Church of Hamburg was extinguished, and Cologne began again to vindicate its claims to Bremen.

It was King HENRY's procedure against GORM the Old, which first re-acquired footing for the mission here. Under Gorm the monarchy in Denmark assumed fixed and permanent forms. **Ledra** on Zeeland, the ancient Danish sanctuary, in which human sacrifices took place, was the seat of his dominion. A friend of the ancient gods and foe of the German power, he was however obliged, in consequence of Henry's victorious advance into Jutland, to permit the restoration of the Danish Mark (934) and the toleration of Christianity. Archbishop UNNI of Bremen appointed Christian priests, and Gorm's son, HARALD BLAATAND (Blue-tooth, 941-986), held in dependence by Otto, received baptism;² bishoprics arose in Sleswick, Ripe and Aarhus. His son SVEN (Fork-beard), who overthrew his father, by the destruction of the Christian foundations once more brought heathenism into predominance, which Eric the victorious of Sweden, who oppressed Sven for fourteen years, also upheld. Sven in association with his fellow-sufferer, OLAF TRYGVASON of Norway, likewise expelled by Eric, became as a sea-king the

¹ Spiritual exercises were served by the collection of prayers on the Psalms, Hymns, and Church-prayers, in his treatise *Pigmenta*, i.e. spice, edited by LAPPENBERG in *Z. für Hamb. Gesch.* ii. 7-32. He also copied theological writings to a large extent. As to the *Vita Willehadi* (p. 94), *vid.* Dehio I. 51, who would limit Ansgar's authorship to the "miracula."

² As to the legend of the fire-miracle of the clerk Poppo *vid.* Dümmler, *Otto d. Gr.* 390 sq.

terror of England, and finally brought the latter entirely into his power. Having been brought into contact here with Anglo-Saxon civilization, when he again became master in Denmark (about 1010), he afforded toleration to Christianity. After his death in 1014, his son, Cnut the Great, formally recognized as king in England from 1016, carried out the victory of Christianity in Denmark with the help of Anglo-Saxon clergy. He now entered into intercourse with the world of Christian culture, went to Rome on pilgrimage in 1026, and under him there wrought in Denmark the powerful and rich Archbishop Unwan, who also brought about the treaty of peace between him and the Emperor Conrad, by which the Danish Mark and the city of Sleswick fell to Denmark, and the Eider was recognized as the frontier of the Empire.

In **Norway**, HARALD HARFAGR (the Fair-haired) in the second half of the ninth century and till about 930, combined a favouring of Christian doctrine with his effort to obtain a strong superiority over the tribal kings and jarls, in which he was followed by his sons ERIC (till his banishment to England) and HAKON the Good. Meanwhile the conflicts about the throne (usurpation of Harald Blaatand) intervened obstructively. OLAF TRYGVASON, a descendant of Harald Harfagr, who attained to rule in 949 after an adventurous life, treated the Church with violence and cruelty. But about 1000 he was so hard pressed by his former comrade in arms, Sven Forkbeard of Denmark along with Olaf (Skautkonung) of Sweden, that he threw himself into the sea. OLAF the Fat, of the ancient royal race, from 1019 carried out with relentless stringency the victory of Christianity and the organization of the Church. The resisting elements found assistance in Cnut of Denmark, to whom the people were devoted. Olaf, who had escaped to Russia to his brother-in-law Jaroslav, returned once more, fell in battle (about 1030), but was soon honoured as Olaf the Saint. Subsequently his son Magnus the Good had the fortune to regain the rule.

The Normans, who in the ninth century dispossessed the then Celtic population, already Christian, on the **North-Western Islands** of the Hebrides, Orkney, Shetland and the Faroe Isles, were won to Christianity in the time of Olaf the Fat by Norwegian influence.

In **Iceland**, which was occupied by immigrant Northmen, THORWALD Codransen, won to the Christian faith abroad, in 981 sqq. caused the German Bishop FREDERICK to conduct mission-work: OLAF TRYGVASON next prompted the missionary activity of the Iclander STEFNIR THORGILSON (996 sqq.), and again the fruitful activity of the Saxon priest DANKBRAND (997-1000). The rapidly increasing Christian party enforced the formal acceptance of Christianity by decision of the national community (1000). ISLEIF GIZURASON, a native of the country, was consecrated bishop in 1055, and under his son and

successor Skaholt became the seat of a bishop, to which a second was shortly added at Holar for the north of the island. The ecclesiastical development subsequently found its first settlement in the recording of a proper Christian law (1122 sq.). *Vid. K. MAURER, Isl. von seiner ersten Entdeckung bis zum Untergang des Freistaats. München 1874.*

In **Sweden**, OLAF SKAUTKONUNG, the son of Eric the Victorious, was the first to appear as a Christian king. His mother SIGRITH, who after Eric's death became the wife of Sven Forkbeard, was a Pole. Connected with this is the fact, that the emissaries of BRUNO of Querfurt, came from Poland to Sweden also; in fact Olaf Skautkonung seems to have been baptized by them about 1008.¹ Olaf called in Anglo-Saxon priests, among them SIGURD (Siegfried) in particular wrought during a long lifetime for the Christian faith as a second apostle of the North. From that time onwards the kings remained Christian, but had continuously to combat with heathen opposition. In East Gothland an independent heathen kingdom maintained itself on into the following period.

2. The Moravian Mission.

Sources: Libellus de conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanor. by the so-called ANONYMUS SALISB. of 871 in MGS. XI. and the *Ep. Episcop. Bavarensium ad P. Johann.* IX. c. 900 in Mansi XVIII. 205, Letters of HADRIAN II. (Jaffé No. 2924 sqq.) JOHN VIII. (Jaffé No. 2970 sqq.) and STEPHEN V. (*ibid.* No. 3407 sqq.). The *Translatio S. Clementis* in Marti's *AsB.* II. 19–21. The so-called Pannonian legend of Saint Methodius edited by Miklosich and Dümmler in *AOeGK.* XIII. (1854), this and other legends of less value in GINZEL, *Gesch. d. Slavenap. Cyrill u. Method.* Leitmeritz 1857. Also the *Serb-Slovenian* legend (founded on a Greek original text) of Saint CYRILL, edited by Dümmler and Miklosich, *SBWA.* XIX. (1870). *Vita S. CLEMENTIS ep. Bulg. græce* ed. Miklosich, Vindob. 1847. COSMAS, *Chronic Prag.* in MGS. IX.—*Literature:* SCHAFARIK, *Slavische Alterthümer* II. 471 sqq. and PALACKY's Bohemian, DUDIK's Moravian, and BÜDINGER's Austrian History, DOBROWSKY, *Cyrill u. Meth.* 1823 (*Id. ü. d. mähr. Legende*, 1826), GINZEL l.c. WATTENBACH, *Beitr. zur Geschichte der christl. K. in Mähren u. Böhmen.* Wien 1849. LEGER, *Cyrille et Methode, étude hist. sur la convers. des Slaves* 1868 and especially DÜMMLER in both l.c.—KAPP in *ZhTh.* 1867.

From the Carolingian Empire the bishoprics of Salzburg and Passau conducted missions among their Slavonic neighbours, **Salzburg** from the Carinthian Mark in Lower Pannonia as far as the Drav, for which extensive sphere we find a regionary bishop of its own under ARNO and his successor Adalram. **Passau** reckoned the East Mark and Upper Pannonia in its see. Here also a special territorial bishop is active about 833 sqq. From here influences went out to the Moravians, united under Duke MOIMIR. Moimir

¹ *Vid. GIESEBRECHT, Kaisergesch.* II. 105 and 648 of the 2nd edition.

received baptism from Bishop Urolf. The chief Pribina, expelled by Moimir, fled to the Pannonian Margrave Ratbad and was baptized in the diocese of Salzburg. In the district of Upper Pannonia, presented by Lewis the German to Pribina at Ratisbon in 848, numerous churches received consecration from Salzburg. About the middle of the ninth century Moravia was regarded as an entirely Christian country.

But Rastislav, who was supported by Lewis the German against Moimir and (in 848) raised to Grand Duke, from 855 turned away from German and towards Greek influences.

By the thronging of the Slavs into Greece, the **Greek Church** was urgently directed to mission work among them. From the beginning of the ninth century their conversion to Christianity goes hand in hand with their overthrow in the ancient Hellenic provinces, their subjection to Greek influences and the planting among them of new Greek colonies. The remnants of the ancient Laconian Hellenes on Taygetus and the Slavs of the Peloponnese were mostly won for Christianity. Contemporaneously the Greek Empire, in the growing weakness of the Frankish West, gains increased power of attraction in the frontier districts on the Adriatic. **Croat Dalmatia** is won (877), the **Nomentani** and other southern Slavs are subjected, receive baptism, and place themselves under the Patriarch of Constantinople, as do also the bishops of the Romance coast cities, who renew the old alliance with Byzantium. From Thessalonica, an essentially Greek city, but entirely surrounded by Slavs, work for their conversion was carried on. Here also the brothers **METHODIUS** and **CONSTANTINE** (mentioned by his later ecclesiastical name of **CYRIL**) were born, sons of Leo, an officer of high rank. The elder (Methodius), occupied in a secular calling until of somewhat ripe age (procurator in a Slavonic district), afterwards retired to a monastery on Olympus (the Olympus near Prusa in Bithynia is meant). The younger (Constantine) was born in 827. He early distinguished himself by his giftedness, talent for language and love of the sciences, but at the same time of philosophic, *i.e.* religious contemplative, life, and received his education in Constantinople from the greatest scholars of the time, Leo of Thessalonica and Photius, the teachers of the Emperor Michael III. He lived for a time in monastic retirement, and again as a teacher of philosophy in Constantinople. He is said to have held a disputation at the court of the Caliph Mutavakkil. The prince of the Chazars north of the Black Sea then invited him to a disputation with Jewish and Moslem theologians, and he determined the prince in favour of

Christianity. At this point RASTISLAV of Moravia, who found himself in a difficult position between Lewis the German and the Bulgarians, and sought attachment to Constantinople, through his nephew SVATOPLUCK begged the Emperor Michael III. to send him Christian teachers, who should put an end to the antagonism of the foreign priests (Frankish, Italian and Greek) who had appeared in his land, and be able to proclaim the Word of God in the Slavonic language. CONSTANTINE and METHODIUS were sent about 863, and in the next three to four years displayed a very important activity. CONSTANTINE gave the Slavs a method of writing, not the **Cyrillian**, but the so-called **Glagolitic**, which, in the beginning of the tenth century, on account of its clumsiness, had to give place to the easier and more convenient Cyrillian.¹ To his activity is attributed the Slavonic (ancient Slovenian) translation of the Bible.² The German clergy in Moravia, whom Methodius moreover reproaches with too great indulgence towards heathen customs, raised opposition to the use of the Slovenian language in worship. The brothers Constantine and Methodius therefore applied to the Pope, and on the invitation of Nicholas I. visited Rome itself. On their way thither they were received in a friendly manner by the Slovenian Prince KOZEL (the son of Pribina) in Pannonia, and had to undergo a vigorous disputation with German clergy in Venice, who contested the justification of the Slavonic liturgy, because God might only be praised in the three sacred languages (Hebrew, Greek and Latin).³ In Rome they were honourably received by Hadrian II., the successor of Nicholas who had just died. He conceded them the use of the Slovenian liturgy and destined Constantine to the archbishopric of Moravia. But the latter, under a sense of his near approaching end, took the cowl, received the ecclesiastical name of CYRIL and died while still in Rome on 14th February, 869. He had brought the relics of S. Clement of Rome, which had been discovered in the Chersonese, to Rome, and now received solemn burial himself in San Clemente, where they were deposited.⁴

At Kozel's request Hadrian sent METHODIUS to be teacher of his people, but at the same time sent his communication (Jaffé, 2924) to Rastislav, and thereby appointed Methodius Archbishop for Pannonia and Moravia together.⁵ Hadrian praised the princes for

¹ MIKLOSICH, art. *Glagolitsch* in Ersch and Gruber's Encycl.

² Chiefly that of the N.T. and the Biblical Lessons and other liturgical texts.

³ For this reason Constantine designated them disciples of Pilate, in allusion to John xix. 20.

⁴ *Vid.* De Rossi, *Bullettino di archeol.* I. 9-14.

⁵ As to the question whether Methodius was at once in Rome elevated to the

applying to the Roman see, which had an ancient right over their lands (ecclesiastical province of Illyria), approved of the work of the Slovenian translation of the Bible begun by Constantine, the continuation of which he encouraged, and recognized the legality of the Slavonic liturgy. But in the Mass, the epistle and gospel were **first** to be read in Latin, and afterwards in Slovenian. The wish to withhold the Slavs of Pannonia from attachment to the **Bulgarians**, who were seeking ecclesiastical alliance with Byzantium again, perhaps explains the extraordinary responsiveness of Rome, in opposition to German wishes.

During the war which broke out, after Rastislav's overthrow by Svatopluck, between Moravia and the East Frankish kingdom (870-874), Methodius could not himself come to Moravia, but worked alongside of Kozel. His episcopal seat seems to have been at Szalavar at the influx of the Szala into the Platten See. But Methodius was accused by Ricbald, a German arch-priest of the diocese of Salzburg, and had to appear before an Austrian synod in the presence of Lewis the German, as Kozel as a vassal of the East Frankish kingdom was unable to protect him. The points in controversy were the Slovenian liturgy, and the claims of Salzburg on the one hand and Rome on the other. Methodius was detained in Germany against his will for several years. Pope John VIII. opposed the Roman claims to Illyria to the historically grounded claims of Salzburg, and demanded satisfaction for Methodius on pain of excommunication, and Lewis was obliged to release him, probably under pressure of the peace with Svatopluck (874) which was unfavourable to him. But John VIII. required Kozel not to detain Methodius and, in contradiction to Hadrian, forbade the use of the Slovenian language in the Mass. Kozel died shortly thereafter and from that time Methodius seems to have had little influence in the Pannonian diocese. He now took up his residence in Moravia with Svatopluck.¹ Here, however, the claims of the German priests who had returned to Moravia were soon renewed, and they also reproached him with the Greek heresy (doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit). The chief of these opponents of Methodius, WICHING, who at the request of Svatopluck was raised by Pope John VIII. to the bishopric of Neithra, won Svatopluck over to the Latin Mass. Methodius was able, on occasion of his personal presence in Rome, to obtain anew from John permission for the employment of the Slovenian liturgy archbishopric of Moravia, or only on a second visit at the request of Kozel, *vid.* DÜMMLER, *Ludw. d. D.* II. 261, note 5.

¹ It remains doubtful whether his residence was Welehrad (*i.e.* Hradisch).

and to repel the attacks of his opponents by means of the Pope's letters. After the death of Methodius (815) the exertions of the German hierarchy against the independence of the Slovenian ecclesiastical system gained new power and also found support in Pope Stephen V.¹ The decay of the great Moravian kingdom (908) soon brought the corresponding turn of events. The disciples of Methodius, Bishop CLEMENT and others, fled to the South, especially to Bulgaria, where, as well as in **Servia** and partly in **Croatia**, the Slavonic worship asserted itself.

3. The Bulgarians.

Sources: Theophanes continuat. ed. Bonn 1838. *PHOTII epistolæ* ed. Montacutius Lond. 1651, pp. 1-45. *Literature:* C. J. JIRECEK, *Gesch. d. Bulgaren*, Prag. 1875.

In Bulgaria, the originally non-Slavonic nation (of Turkish race), on its settlement in the ancient Mœsia, underwent such strong intermixture with the far more numerous subject Slavs, that it resigned itself to the Slavonic language and then to Slavonic-Christian civilization. The Bulgarians, who had again made themselves so terrible to the Greek Empire in the beginning of the ninth century,² from that time, being in contact with the Greek world of civilization, began to open to Christianity. Bishop Manuel of Adrianople, whom they took prisoner, did indeed pay with his life for his zeal for the Christian faith under the Bulgarian John Mortagon. But the Khan Boris (Bogoris), when in 864 he concluded peace with the Greek Empire, received baptism, after he had requested and obtained a bishop from the Emperor Michael III. and the Patriarch Photius.³ A heathen party was bloodily defeated. But alongside of the Christianity of the Greek Church we also find Armenian Monophysites, Paulicians and Jews in the land. There immediately began the struggle between Rome and Byzantium for the ecclesiastical possession of Bulgaria,⁴ which after a short alliance

¹ The genuineness of his letter to Svatopluck might be maintained against Ginzel.

² Death of the Emperor Nicephorus I.

³ It is a groundless assumption that Methodius and Constantine (Cyril) went to Moravia by way of Bulgaria and conducted mission-work there; if the story, that a METHODIUS made a striking impression on Bogoris by means of a picture of the last judgment (Theophanes contin.), has historical value at all, it must be referred to some other Methodius than the famous Apostle of the Slavs. Cf. HIRSCH, *Byzant. Studien*, p. 218. DÜMLER, *G. d. Ostfr. R.* II., 187.

⁴ As early as 866, two years after his baptism by a Greek bishop, Bogoris petitioned Lewis the German and Pope Nicholas I. to send him bishops of the correct faith.

with Rome, ended in its attachment to the Greek Church. At the same time the Slavonic element obtains the predominance, inasmuch as Bishop Clement, the pupil of Methodius, after his flight from Moravia, worked with much influence in Bulgaria. Similarly, under the second son of Bogoris, Symeon (893-927), who became so dangerous to Byzantium, Slavo-Bulgarian Christian literature received powerful incentives to development.

4. Bohemia.

Sources : COSMAS *Chron. vid. sup.* p. 142. L. BÜDINGER, *österr. Gesch.* I. and *Zur Kritik der Altböhm. G.* in ZOeG. 1857.

The bishopric of Ratisbon did indeed lay claim to Bohemia. More important for its conversion to Christianity was its political attachment to the kingdom of Moravia under Rastislav and Svato-pluck. The latter's father-in-law, Borzivoi of Bohemia, had himself baptized with his wife LUDMILLA. Their grandson WENZESLAV (928-935), who was devoted to the Church and again acknowledged Bohemia's dependence on the German Empire, and under whom many German priests came into the country, was slain by his brother Boleslav the Cruel. The latter, although himself a Christian, was won by the heathen national party, rent Bohemia away from the Empire (till Otto I. again subjected it), but was unable to uproot Christianity; three years later he caused the relics of his brother to be brought to the church of S. Vitus in Prague.

BOLESLAV the Pious was the first to carry out Christianity strictly, now, however, in the **Latin** form. After setting aside the older claims of Ratisbon, a bishopric was erected in Prague (975 or 976), in which, in accordance with the requirement of Pope John XVI. the Latin rite was the rule from the very beginning. After the exertions of the first bishop, the Saxon Thietmar, which bore little fruit, there succeeded the young Bohemian ADALBERT, whose mind was filled with his predecessor's complaints of the obstinate resistance of the Czechs, and who at the diet of the Empire at Verona (983) under Otto III., received consecration from Archbishop Willigis of Mayence, and pilgrimaged bare-foot to Prague, but with his ecclesiastical and monastic strictness, found such obstinate resistance, that he again left Prague, to live as a hermit in Italy. Boleslav and Willigis did indeed induce him after a few years to return to Bohemia, where in the meantime the affairs of the Church had fallen into entire disorder, while Boleslav in association with the heathen Liutizes made war on the German Empire. But Adalbert withdrew a second time, and when, at the Pope's command, he would have returned a third time, he was no longer received (*vid. inf.*).

5. Conversion of the Wends.

Sources: WIDUKIND'S (of Corvey) *Res gestæ Saxonica*, SrG. 4 rec. Waitz, 3rd ed. Hann. 1882, MGS. III. THIETMARI (ep. Meseb.) *Chronica* SrG. 38 rec. Lappenb. u. Kluge 1889 (MGS. III.) and Adam Brem. (p. 136).—HELMOLD, *Chronica Slavorum*, rec. Lappenb. Hann. 1868 (MGS. XXI.) and SAXO-GRAMM. ed. A. Holder 1886 are based on Adam of Bremen for the older period and only become of independent importance for the later. *Literature*: L. GIESEBRECHT, *Wendische Geschichten*, 3 vols. 1843.—WIGGERS, *KG. Mecklenburgs*, 1840.

Under the Saxon princes Henry I. and Otto I. there arose on the Wendish frontier the Margravates of Meissen (for the Sorbs), East-Saxony (Lusatia) and North-Saxony (Altmark). Henry advanced against the Wiltzes and Liutitzes on the Havel and conquered **Brandenburg**. Otto sought to secure his rule by the erection of bishoprics. In **Oldenburg** in Holstein (Slavonic Stargard), where Bishop Adalward of Verden had already been active in spiritual mission-work among the Obotrites, Otto, in the last years of his life, founded a bishopric for Wagrians and Obotrites in East Holstein and Mecklenburg as far as the Peene and the Elbe, which was to be under the archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen and the protection of the Saxon Duke Hermann Billung. For the Wends who were baptized by Saxon clergy on the Havel and the Spree, he founded the bishoprics of **Havelberg** (Redarians) in 946 and **Brandenburg** (Hevellians) in 948, which at first stood under Mayence. But finally, disregarding the initial resistance of Mayence, on his third visit to Rome, with the consent of the Pope, he erected an **archbishop** in **Magdeburg** in 968, where in 937 he had already founded a richly endowed Benedictine monastery. To it Halberstadt was obliged to surrender a part of its diocese. Under Magdeburg came the bishoprics of **Havelberg** and **Brandenburg**, the likewise already founded bishopric of Meissen, as well as the two new bishoprics of **Zeitz** and **Merseburg** for the districts between the Saale and the Elbe. Soon thereafter Mayence found itself indemnified by the subordination to it of Prague and a Moravian bishopric. ADALBERT, hitherto Abbot of **Weissenburg** in the Speiergau, in Rome, in October, 968, received the pallium and equal rights with the Archbishops of Mayence, Trèves and Cologne. The death of the Margrave Gero and the abolition of the bishopric carried out by Bishop Giseler of Merseburg are events detrimental to the unity and power of the Saxon race.

But in revolt in the end of the reign of Otto III., the Wends in greater part shook off again the Christianity which had been thrust upon them; Havelberg and Brandenburg fell in 983, the Obotrites

rose in revolt under Duke Mistui (Mistewoi), the archbishopric of Magdeburg lost everything beyond the Elbe. It was only among the Obotrites belonging to Bremen-Hamburg (in the bishopric of Oldenburg) that remains of Christian institutions were preserved, and in the bishoprics of Merseburg (abolished for a time but restored under Henry II.), Zeitz and Meissen, the Church established itself under German rule.

The Wendish prince GOTTSCHALK, a grandson of Mistui, who had been brought up as a Christian in a monastery, had then become a furious foe of the Saxon oppressors, and had finally been again won to the Christian Church, worked energetically from 1045 in his great kingdom between the Elbe and the Baltic, under the influence of the Duchy of Saxony, for the carrying out of Christianity and German customs and state-administration, founded numerous churches and monasteries and the two bishoprics of Ratzeburg and Mecklenburg (near Wismar); but in the midst of his Christian enterprises, he fell at Lenzen in Priegnitz in 1060, and along with him his creation was again swallowed up by heathenism.

6. Poland, Prussia, and Hungary.

Sources: Of German chroniclers specially THIETMAR (p. 148). *Passio S. ADALBERTI Martyris* in *Script. rer. Borussicarum* I. 235 and the two *vitæ* of Adalbert by J. CANAPARIUS and by BRUNO in MGS. IV. 531 and 596;—BRUNONIS *epistola ad Henricum II.* in GIESEBRECHT'S *Kaisergeschichte* II. Appendix. *Literature:* The history of Poland by RÖPEL, of Prussia by J. VOIGT, of the Magyars by J. v. MAILATH, 2nd ed. and by FESSLER (newly revised by KLEIN 2nd ed. 1875–80).—GIESEBRECHT, *G. d. d. Kaiserzeit* I. and II.—FRIESE, *KG. des Kr. Polen* I. 1786.

1. After previous influences proceeding from Moravia, in **Poland**, Miecislav I. (Miesco), the husband of the Bohemian Dubravka, the sister of Boleslav II., first accepted Christianity in 966, and, being compelled by Otto II. to recognize German supremacy, founded the bishopric of Posen,¹ which came under the authority of Mayence, but soon under that of Magdeburg.—To the Polish Boleslav I. (Chrobry, 992–1025) the Brave, who also ruled over a great part of Pomerania, a part of Prussia, Masovians, Cracovians and Silesians, came ADALBERT of Prague (*vid. sup.*), with the object, at the Pope's command, of seeking entry into Prague for the third time. Repulsed there, under Boleslav's protection he went down the Weichsel and on board ship as far as the neighbourhood of Königsberg, without having any success. On the point of returning, he

¹ According to ZEISSBERG AOeG. 38, 74 the rise of the bishopric of Posen already took place in the time of Otto I.

was stabbed by the Prussians in 997, on account of an unconscious violation of a sacred field. Boleslav redeemed his corpse and his captive companions and brought the former to **Gnesen**. Here (about 1000), at the instigation of Otto III., he founded the archbishopric of **Gnesen**, with the bishoprics of Kolberg (for Pomerania), Cracow (for Chrobatia) and Breslau (for Silesia). (Posen remained at first under Magdeburg.) The independent organization of the Polish Church, which was reprehended in Germany, subserved his successful endeavour to strip off the supremacy over it which Germany continued to claim, and on the other hand, promoted direct alliance with Rome.

To Boleslav there then came, with the object of emulating the example of Adalbert of Prague, whom he venerated, the Saxon nobleman BRUN (of Querfurt), a relation of the Saxon ruling house, who had come to Italy in the company of Otto III. and had there been seized by the same spirit of visionary asceticism as Adalbert. Pope Sylvester II. appointed him Archbishop of the heathens, and the Archbishop of Magdeburg (*not* of Gnesen) was obliged to give him consecration in 1004. As the political opposition of Henry II. to Boleslav was a hindrance to the plans of Brun, he went first to **Hungary**, then to Kieff to the Russian Grandprince VLADIMIR and as far as the Lower Don and the mouths of the Danube to the wild **Patzinaks**, with the object of inducing them to an alliance with Vladimir and the acceptance of Christianity, which indeed had only transitory success. Returning to Boleslav, he worked successfully through his emissaries in **Sweden** (*vid. sup.* p. 142) and then pursued Adalbert's route to Prussia, where along with all his companions he met death by decapitation in 1009 on the eastern frontier of the country. Boleslav stringently maintained Christianity in Poland, and his successor, MIECISLAV II. also sought to strengthen it; he founded the bishopric of **Cujavia** for the Wendish country on the Weichsel. But the political disorders after his death (1034) occasioned the falling away of great masses from Christianity. The bishopric of Posen detached itself from Magdeburg and came under **Gnesen**, which however was devastated by the Bohemians, who took the body of S. Adalbert to Prague. After the return of Miecislav's son, CASIMIR, who had fled to Germany, ecclesiastical order was only very gradually restored.

2. From the middle of the ninth century the **Magyars** disturbed **Pannonia**, where they settled at its end, and whence in the tenth century they carried terror with their hordes of riders into the German Empire and Italy. In them the ancient **Huns** seemed to

return. The great Moravian kingdom suffered their attacks in 908, the Carolingian East Mark disappeared, the country below the Enns fell into their hands, Bavaria especially had to suffer frightfully from the barbarism of these hordes, who had reached only a very low degree of civilization, till Henry of Bavaria and then Otto I.'s victory at the battle of Lechfeld (955) set a limit to their predatory excursions. At that time the Hungarians were still essentially heathen, although their relation to the Chazars, the influence of numerous, especially female, captives, and their relations to the **Greek** Empire, which was likewise menaced by them, had already brought them near to Christianity, and the chieftain **GYLAS**, baptized in Constantinople about 950, had already begun Christianization in the country of the Wallachs (the modern Transylvania). After the battle of Lechfeld, and after in 970 they had suffered a complete overthrow by the Greek Empire, they found the necessity of uniting their loosely allied tribes, and of adopting a fixed and settled life. The way was being paved for an internal revolution, which led to the pursuit of agriculture, the development of the monarchy, and at the same time, to the acceptance of the Christian Church as the intellectual organizing power. Thus **GEYSA**, under whom the proper formation of the Hungarian State began, became Christian, but, it is true, continued to sacrifice to the heathen gods. At the same time began the immigration of Christian colonists. A Swabian, **WOLFGANG**, teacher in the monastery of Einsiedeln, a friend of Bruno of Cologne, worked as a missionary in Hungary, but was re-called by Bishop Pilgrim of Passau, who reckoned on the earlier relation of Hungary to his see and desired no foreign influence. By means of doubtless exaggerated representations of the success of his own exertions, Pilgrim sought to obtain from Pope **BENEDICT VII.** the recognition of the alleged ancient claims of Passau to archiepiscopal rank, making proffer of the foundation of seven bishoprics for Hungary and Moravia. But in vain. At that time rather the rights of the archbishopric of Salzburg over Passau itself were expressly recognized. **ADALBERT** of Prague also, both personally and by emissaries, worked temporarily and with small success in Hungary. The Church, which had made but very small advance under Geysa, only attained to decided victory under his successor **STEPHEN** (997-1038). He first really came over to Christianity on his marriage with **GISELA** of Bavaria (the sister of the future King Henry II.), and assumed the obligation to carry out the organization of the Church. Every ten villages were obliged to build and equip a church; whoever would not become a

Christian, became a serf. Supported by Otto III., he gave the Church of Hungary, under dependence on Rome, an organization of its own under one archbishopric (**Gran**), and in the year 1000 placed on his head the royal crown sent him by Pope Sylvester II. The violent procedure of Stephen brought about reactions both against Christianity and his monarchy after his death, but the Church nevertheless remained assured for future times.

7. Chazars and Russians.

Sources: NESTOR'S *Russian Annals*, translated by Schlözer, 5 vols. Göttingen 1802. (Nestor's Chronicle by Miklosich, Vienna 1860). *Literature:* Ph. STRAHL, *Beitr. zur russ. K.G.* 1827. Ejdm. *Gesch. d. russ. Kirche* 1830. PHILARET, *Gesch. der K. Russl.*, in German by Blumenthal, 2 vols. 1872. Cf. PICHLER, *Gesch. der kirchl. Trennung zwischen Orient und Occident*, i. 1-7, BONWETSCH, *Zur Einführung der Chr. in Russland*, Ev. luth. Kz. 1888, 31 sq.

The nomad nation of the **Chazars**, north of the Black Sea, had gradually spread, from the coast of the Caspian and the Caucasian isthmus, as far as beyond the Don and the Dnieper, reaching north as far as the Oka. Their Chakhan (Grand Khan) resided at **Itil**, not far from the mouth of the Volga (Astrakhan) and ruled, by means of a nucleus composed of a standing army, over nations of the most various races, languages and religions. The Goths on the Tauric peninsula were Christian, the Slavs in the North and West were heathen, the army for the most part consisted of Mohammedans. The ruling family, of Turkish origin, in the ninth and tenth centuries at least, adhered to the Jewish faith, the rest of the Chazars and most nearly related Finns were mostly still heathen, but in part were Christian or Moslem. The embassy of Constantine (Cyril) to the Chazar court (*vid. sup.* p. 143) sheds light on these mixed relationships. Among the Slavs in modern **Russia**, in the centre, **Novgorod**, **Smolensk**, and **Kieff** formed the oldest and most important points. Finnish tribes (Letts, Livonians, Esthonians, Lapps, etc.) attached themselves on the north. In many cases these Slavs had come into contact, partly hostile, partly commercial (especially at Novgorod), with the **Northmen**, the Varangians. Internal discords and external distresses caused them to apply to the **Warägi** (Russians) who belonged to the former, to assume the dominion and restore order. RURIK († 879) and his brothers and men answered this appeal, and by the alliance of this ruling warlike tribe of **Norman descent** with the Slavs there was thus formed the nucleus of modern Russia, which speedily grew up under Rurik's race; in the process, the tribe, which at first was continually

strengthened by new reinforcements, was gradually more and more amalgamated with the subject Slavs and Finns. The growing power of the Russians, to whom a multitude of smaller Slavonic tribes subjected themselves, led to the collision with the Chazars, the conquest of Kieff, and contact with Constantinople, which received mercenaries from among them, and afforded lively commercial intercourse, but also, both once in the time of Michael III. after the middle of the ninth century, and repeatedly afterwards, was thrown into terror by Russian hosts, and had to keep its troublesome guests in good temper by rich presents and treaties of peace and commerce.

An attempt to convert the Russians was made as early as the time of Photius (second half of the ninth century), and in the time of IGOR, the son of Rurik (about 900), a church existed in **Kieff**. Igor's widow, OLGA, likewise of Norman descent, who successfully conducted the government during the minority of her son SVATOSLAV, received Christian baptism along with her following in 955 at Constantinople, where she was received with great splendour; the Emperor CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS was her godfather, and himself circumstantially described her entry.¹ But Olga was not yet able to draw her people after her; Svatoslav also refused to follow her. An embassy of Olga's to the Emperor Otto I. also occasioned a missionary attempt from the West by Abbot Adalbert, the subsequent Archbishop of Magdeburg, but without success.² It was only after the subjection of the Bulgarians by Svatoslav and after bloody wars under Jaropolk that Vladimir the Great (980-1005) was able essentially to promote his object of blending the manifold national elements, by accepting Christianity and carrying out its introduction. When Vladimir conquered³ the ancient city of Cherson on the peninsula of Taurus, he married Anna, the sister of the Emperor Basil, in 988, of which the Emperor made his baptism a condition.⁴ Accompanied by priests and relics, Vladimir returned to Kieff, caused the venerated idol to be tied to a horse's tail, to be beaten with clubs and thrown into the Dnieper. He commanded his subjects to receive baptism, with the threat that otherwise, they would be treated as enemies of God and the Grand

¹ Const. Porphy. *De cerimon.* II. 15 ed. Bonn. 1829 p. 594.

² *Vid.* the passages in Schlözer's translation of Nestor, V. 106, 109.

³ Said to have been assisted by the treason of a priest, who then became Metropolitan of Kieff.

⁴ By the marriage he at the same time became brother-in-law of the German Emperor Otto II.

prince. The legislation of his successor JAROSLAV shows, along with the fixing of judicial tradition,¹ the beginning of the influence of Christianity on the state of law. Kieff became the centre of the Russian Church, the metropolitan there standing under the Patriarch of Constantinople. During a time of political tension with Constantinople, Jaroslav did indeed leave the see unoccupied for four years after the death of Theopempt the first metropolitan (1047), and then (1050) caused the Russian bishops to elect a born Russian, the monk HILARION, the founder of the cave-monastery of Kieff (Petschera), who ruled the Russian Church for twenty years. But the relationship to Constantinople was maintained. From Bulgaria the Russian Church received the Slavonic (Cyrillian) Bible and the ancient Slovenian ecclesiastical language. The above cave-monastery became the seed-plot of ecclesiastical culture and literature. Here the first Russian chronicler, NESTOR, worked at the beginning of the following period.

¹ In Slavonic and German, in Ewers, *Das älteste Recht der Russen in seiner geschichtl. Entwicklung*, Dorp. 1826, p. 264 sqq.

CHAPTER SECOND.

The Papacy and the Hierarchy.

Sources : Till towards the end of the ninth century the **Liber Pontificalis** (i. 340). From that time onwards: J. M. WATTERICH, *Pontificum Romanorum qui fuerunt inde ab exeunte sæculo IX. usque ad finem s. XIII. vitæ ab æqualibus conscriptæ*. T. I. (Joh. VIII. to Urban II. 872-1099) Lips. 1862. Along with the catalogues of the popes and other sources standing near to the time, the most important documents and numerous relative fragments taken from chronicles and other sources. The **Acts** of Synods and the most of the relative papal letters in MANSI XIV.-XX. JAFFÉ, *Reg. I.*, HEFELE IV. *Literature*: BAXMANN, II. (p. 84), GREGOROVIVS, *Gesch. d. Stadt. Rom.*

1. The Popes, the Church and the Frankish Monarchy till after the middle of the Ninth Century.

Sources: *Capitularia reg. franc.* ed. BORETIUS *vid. sup.* p. 67. Th. SICKEL *Acta regum et imperatorum Carolinorum*, 2 vols. Wien 1867 sqq. *Literature*: W. SIMSON, *Jbb. d. fränk. Reiches unter Ludw. d. Fr.* 2 vols., Lpz. 1874-76. E. DÜMLER, *G. d. ostfr. Reichs*, I. LUDWIG d. D. bis zum Frieden von Koblenz 860. 2nd ed. Lpz. 1887 (*Jbb. d. deutschen Gesch.*).

1. Under LEWIS the Pious (814-840), in the quarrel with his sons, there begins the crumbling to pieces of the Carolingian Empire, amid the lively participation of the higher clergy of the Frankish Empire, who at first at least represented the conception of the **unity of the Empire** as the **correlative of the unity of the Church** in a manner which was contradictory of Frankish traditions. This was so far realized in the act of partition of 817, inasmuch as, while Pippin received Aquitaine, and Lewis Bavaria, all the rest was to remain under the Emperors, father and son. The *unitas imperii* was not to be rent asunder out of love to sons, *ne scandalum in sancta ecclesia oriretur*. After, at the instigation of his second wife, Judith, Lewis abolished this ordinance in 829 in the interest of Judith's son Charles (the Bald), a number of the most influential prelates took the side of the elder sons, LOTHAR and PIPPIN, who fought their father on this account and accomplished his humiliation at Compiègne in 830. Against LOTHAR's oppressive preponderance PIPPIN and LEWIS did indeed again turn to their father at first. But the elder brothers once more proceeded in common against their father, who was deserted by them all on the Field of Lies near Colmar (833) and was also betrayed by Pope Gregory IV., who had hastened to his side; he was to have been made incapable of bearing arms, and so of ruling, by enforced solemn ecclesiastical penance at Soissons. But the interference of Lewis (the German) now put an end to his father's state of constraint, and at the Diet at **Diedenhofen** in 835 the entire body of prelates declared the deposition illegal and solemnly restored Lewis the Pious. EBO of Rheims, who took special part in the procedure against the Emperor

had now to do ecclesiastical penance and declare himself unworthy of the priesthood; and AGOBARD of Lyons was deposed from his archiepiscopal dignity on like grounds. But the conflicts continued after the death of Lewis the Pious, the bloody internecine battle of **Fontanetum** (June, 841), on the brook of the Burgundiones,¹ between Lewis and Charles on the one side and Lothar on the other, led finally to the treaty of **Verdun** (843), in which LEWIS the German († 876) received **Germany** as far as the Rhine, but also the districts of Mayence, Worms and Spire, on the left bank of the Rhine, CHARLES the Bald († 877) received Gaul, West Burgundy and the Spanish Mark, LOTHAR as EMPEROR († 855), Italy with Rome, Ravenna, East Burgundy, Alsace, and Friesland. Of the sons of the last-named, LEWIS II. received Italy and the title of Emperor, Lothar II. Lorraine (Alsace and the lands between the Rhine and the Scheldt, the Meuse and the Saone) and Friesland; Charles, Burgundy and Provence. But after the death of the last two, their two uncles Charles the Bald and Lewis the German took possession of the inheritance, and the treaty of Meerssen in 870 completed the definitive separation of the Romance (Burgundian and Provençal) portions from the German.

2. **Position of the Popes.**² Lewis the Pious decidedly vindicated his right of dominion over Rome and the Pope as his vassal, and further, called Leo III. to account for the exercise of capital jurisdiction. Stephen IV. at once caused the Romans to swear fidelity to the Emperor, and ordained that the consecration of the Pope must take place in the presence of the imperial ambassadors. Paschal I. made excuses for the neglect of this ordinance to Lewis the Pious. He seems also to have received from Lewis the promise that in the future only after the consecration of the Pope had taken place should his ambassadors negotiate with the Emperor on friendship and peace.³ But the patent "*Ego Ludovicus*," etc., which refers to this matter, and which at the same time assigns to the Roman see, in addition to the earlier donations, Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily and the patrimonies in Calabria, is if not altogether spurious, at least falsified. Lewis the Pious repeatedly sent his son Lothar, who received the crown in Rome from Paschal, over the Alps to curb Rome, and after the election of EUGENIUS II., LOTHAR in reference to acts of violence which had taken place, arranged affairs on the spot by the **Constitutio Romana**.⁴ Obedience to the Pope was here inculcated, but the Emperor's right as superior was also maintained. Envoys of the Emperor and the Pope were to watch jointly over the administration of justice and bring acts of violence to the knowledge of the Pope, who was obliged, either himself to provide

¹ According to Waitz and Dümmler not far from Auxerres.

² Stephen IV., 816-817. Paschal I.—824 Eugenius II.—827. Valentinus—Gregory IV. 827-844. Sergius II.—147. Leo IV.—855. Benedict III. till 858.

³ MGL. II.b, pag. 9.

⁴ MGL. I. 239, in Boretius p. 323.

for their abolition, or to hand the affair over to the Emperor for discharge. The **election of a pope**¹ was to be carried out without the disturbing participation of the masses, by those Romans only who had a right to do so in accordance with long consecrated tradition. The clergy and people were obliged to swear fealty to Lewis and his sons, without prejudice to the fidelity due to the Pope, and to vow to refrain from all uncanonical procedure at papal elections, and from any attempt to consecrate a pope, before he had bound himself by oath in the presence of the imperial envoys. This was not indeed observed at the election of Valentine, who only reigned one month, but probably at the election of Gregory IV. In the conflict of the sons against Lewis the Pious, Gregory IV. took the side of the former and the clerical party which supported them (Wala, Agobard, etc.), marched with Lothar across the Alps and threatened the opposite party with excommunication, but experienced the most decided resistance even from the Frankish Church, and then sought in vain to mediate. Pope Sergius II., elected and consecrated without regard to the Emperor, with the Roman magnates, refused to render the oath of fealty to the young king Lewis, sent by the Emperor Lothar to Italy, for the reason that Rome ought only to be subject to one Emperor; but they had to agree to renew solemnly their oath of fealty to the Emperor. Thereupon Sergius anointed LEWIS with holy oil **King of the Lombards**, a new and unusual performance, from which the Pope might claim increase of his authority.

At the same time, however, at the desire of the Emperor Lothar, he appointed the latter's highly esteemed uncle Drogo, the Bishop of Metz, to be apostolic Vicar (*Primas*) over all Gaul and Germany, in the interest certainly of the closer unity of the Frankish Church as against the partial kingdoms, but at the same time according to the wish of the Emperor, who desired to gain in Drogo an organ of influence in the realms of his brothers also (Jaffé, No. 2586). But Drogo was unable to vindicate the claims of this position. Leo IV.'s election and consecration also ensued, without delay for the Emperor's confirmation of the latter. Leo excused himself on the ground of the danger which threatened from the Saracens and promised future obedience to the Roman statute, which he liked to designate as a treaty between the Pope and the Emperor (Jaffé,

¹ Vid. H. DOPFFEL, *Kaiserthum und Papstwechsel unter den Karolingern*. Frib. i. B. 1888, who however erroneously sees in the claims of the Emperor to influence the election of the Pope, the rise of a new right. Vid. Hauck in ThLZ. 1890, No. 11.

2652). In August, 846, a Saracen fleet had ascended the Tiber as far as Rome, had plundered the right bank and made prisoners, and many Romans had been slain in a sanguinary fight. The Franko-Italian army, which in the end came up in support, suffered a decided defeat; it was in the end only owing to a storm that the greater part of the Saracen fleet was destroyed. While in this way the protection of the imperial authority proved to be very inadequate, the cautious and energetic Pope Leo IV., who had gained his position by the free choice of the Romans, earned great merit in securing Rome by restoring the ancient Aurelian wall, fortifying the mouth of the Tiber, and enclosing the district around S. Peter's (Leonine City) within walls. Increased self confidence becomes clearly evident in him; in his bulls he began regularly to place his own name before that of the person addressed, and avoided calling the Emperor and princes *dominus*. The acts of the council of 853, for the first time have alongside of the date according to the years of the Emperor's, that according to the years of the Pope's reign. In the same year he was able to anoint and crown at Rome the Anglo-Saxon King Ethelwolf and his son, afterwards Alfred the Great. And the choice of his successor, Benedict III., was only announced to the two emperors (Lothar and Lewis II.), after he had been placed upon the papal throne. The imperial envoys at first attached themselves to an opposition party, which would have used violence against him, but were finally obliged to recognize him; he was consecrated in their presence. In these years the idea of moving against the Frankish Emperor by a league with the Greeks, arose in Rome.

3. The practical revolution in relative powers and accordingly in pretensions since the days of Charlemagne showed itself in the significance which it was now sought to give to the anointing of the emperors and kings. Charlemagne had himself caused the crown to be placed on the head of his son Lewis; Lewis the Pious proceeded in like manner with Lothar, and the latter with Lewis II. Nevertheless Pope Stephen anointed Lewis the Pious when he visited him in Rheims in 816; so likewise did the Popes with Lothar and Lewis on occasion of their presence in Rome. On such spiritual consecration of the secular government the spiritual power then founded a kind of theocratic claim, to which, in circumstances in which it was to their interest to do so, the rulers began to make appeal. The Emperor Lewis II. in 871, in opposition to the Greek Emperor, derived the divine right of his imperial rank from the papal consecration, and compared the Pope to Samuel, who after the

rejection of Saul (the Greek Emperor) crowned David (Charlemagne).

In like manner the controversies of the sons of Lewis with him and among themselves, led to their appealing to the voices of the bishops, and led the latter to ascribe to themselves, as the representatives of the divine authority, a kind of judicial power over the rulers, although they were themselves most deeply involved in political relations and bound by political considerations. Thus the Synod of Paris of 829, in a communication to Lothar, appealed to the fact, that according to Rufinus, *Hist. Eccles.* x., 2, Constantine the Great had attributed to the bishops a judicial power over himself. At the assembly at Compiègne in 833 they laid claim to the right to judge the king, inasmuch as they condemned him to public penance on account of his acts of government; and in the year 842 the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle deposed the Emperor Lothar.¹

Addendum. **Pope Joan.** The legend, which first appears in the thirteenth century in Stephanus de Borbone, but which was quickly spread, especially by the popular chronicle of Martinus Polonus, into whose MSS. it soon insinuated itself, tells of a maiden, Agnes, who in man's attire had followed her career in Rome at the papal curia, and in the end had herself become pope as John VIII. (Anglicus), but had then been delivered of a child, whereby the deceit was revealed. The legend which interpolates this popess between Leo IV. and Benedict, was ingenuously believed at the close of the Middle Ages. Protestant polemics utilized it, but the Protestant David Blondel was the first to supply a detailed demonstration of its unhistorical character. In our own century Kist would still have maintained its historical character, which however is now generally given up. Historical interest only attaches now to the question of the origin of the legend. On this point *vid.* Döllinger, *Papstfabeln*, München 1863.

2. The Revolution in the views of Ecclesiastical Law.

Sources: The editio princeps of the Pseudo-Isidore in MERLIN, *Collectio canonum* 1523, often repeated since then, also ML 130. Critical edition: HINSCHIUS, *Decretales pseudoisidorianæ et capitula Angilrami*. Lps. 1863. BENEDICTI LEVITÆ *Capitularia* in MGL. III.—Of the very abundant literature: KUNST's dissertation in the edition of Benedictus Levita in MG. and HINSCHIUS in the *Commentatio* on his edition. WASSERSCHLEBEN, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der falschen Decretalen*, 1844 and RE. 12, 367. J. WEIZSÄCKER, *die Pseudoisidorianische Frage* in Sybel HZ. III., 44, and the text-books of ecclesiastical law by Schulte, Philipps and L. Richter revised by Dove-Kahl 1877.

In the early stages of the decay of the Carolingian Empire, the inclination of the Popes was directed towards freeing themselves from the supremacy of the Emperors. The hierarchy in general,

¹ As the unglossed expression of the conviction which was being formed, *vid.* Nithart, *Hist.* 4, 1 (SrG. 3 ed. Pertz. ed. 2, Hann. 1870.).

the power and influence of which hitherto, under Charles's powerful hand, had been made part of the organism of, and serviceable to, the Empire as a whole, tried to obtain a spiritual jurisdiction in secular things also on the strength of its divine vocation. On the other hand, in the civil wars after Charles's death, the preponderance of the secular power and the insecurity of the Church in these conflicts, made themselves most sensibly felt, and were bound to promote the endeavour of the higher clergy to diminish their dependence on the secular power and extend their ecclesiastical power.¹ But above all, for this purpose, allegiance to the Pope, as the natural champion of the Church, recommended itself. The Council of Paris in 829 already placed the papacy and the Empire parallel as the two greatest powers, with a view to gaining due authority for the bishops as the representatives of the ecclesiastical power. The spiritual law, of Roman origin and universal (not national) character, appropriated by Charlemagne in his capitularies, but also modified and introduced into the system of the political law of the Empire, began to be felt as an independent power and to be made serviceable to the interests of the bishops.

For the material of his extensive ecclesiastical law, Charles, as has been noted, had received from Pope Hadrian and utilized in his legislation, the augmented Dionysian collection as that which was consecrated by Roman usage. Along with it other collections, such as the so-called **Hispana**, were also known in the Frankish Empire, and individual bishops also supplied smaller collections for practical use, which combined with it local regulations and special ordinances for the regulation of the ecclesiastical discipline of their dioceses, the "*capitula episcoporum*," such as those of Theodulf of Orleans (about 797), Hatto of Bâle, and later, Hincmar of Rheims and others. But there also appeared important collections of church-law with definite ecclesiastico-legal tendency, and decretals adjusted or **invented** accordingly: the famous **Pseudoisidorian Collection**, the collection of capitularies by BENEDICT which in its origin comes into close connection with it, and the so-called **Capitula Angilrami**, both of which latter are joined to the **Pseudoisidore** in many MSS.

The preface prefixed to this collection under the name of a certain Isidorus Mercator,² which is essentially based on the substance of the so-called *Hispana*,

¹ Florus (of Lyons) attempted to prove from some constitutions of Roman Emperors, that the clergy were free from secular jurisdiction. *Vid.* MAASSEN, *Ein Commentar des Florus* in SBWA. XLII., 103.

² On this name *vid.* Hinschius ZKR. VI. 148 sqq.

was for that reason explained as referring to the celebrated Isidorus Hispalensis. The compilation contains in Part I., besides a few other pieces, the fifty so-called Apostolic Canons received by the Church (*vid.* I. 234, II. 11) and fifty-nine alleged, but all spurious, letters of the Roman bishops, from Clemens down to Melchiades (+ 314), in chronological order; in Part II. there follow, after a few other pieces (of which the *Donatio Constantini ad Sylvestrum* is the most important) the Canons of many councils, beginning with that of Nicaea, essentially following the *Hispana* (falsification is only perceptible in one passage); Part III. gives the decretal letters of the Roman bishops from Sylvester to Gregory II. (+ 731), of which thirty-five are spurious. The author has therefore admitted a number of already existing anonymous pieces, and the Epistle of Clement to James (from the Clementine Homilies), the *Donatio Constantini* and the *Constitutio Sylvestri*, but has invented the most of the spurious papal letters, for doing which Rufinus, Cassiodorius, and the Liber Pontificalis must have supplied him with the historical substratum, and older ecclesiastical authors, acts of councils, etc. with the material.

As against the *imperium*, the claims put in the mouths of the older popes do indeed exalt the *sacerdotium*, the see of Rome and the primacy of Peter and the standard authority of papal decretal letters, but less in the interest of the papacy itself, than in that of the **Episcopate**, which seeks by exalting the papacy to protect and reserve itself against the oppression of kings and the spoliations of the great, so as not to be subjected to secular force by one-sided judgment in consequence of political negotiations. Hence it is required, (1) as against the secular power, that the competence of **secular courts** in the affairs of the bishops should be excluded, and that the secular authorities should not summon any synod or condemn any bishop without papal consent. Nor in the **spiritual** court might any layman appear as accuser or witness against bishops or clergy, or the *reges aut potestates* exercise any influence. On the other hand, **secular** affairs might be brought before a spiritual court, and every sufferer of violence might appeal to a spiritual court. But (2) it is also sought most assiduously to secure the bishops as against their metropolitans and provincial synods. The existing hierarchical organization is indeed recognised, and further, the insertion of a grade, that of the **primacy**, is recommended as a means of mediation between the Pope and the metropolitans, probably with a view to affording the individual provincial churches a stronger support against the sovereign. But the position of the bishop is to be made as unassailable as possible. Not the metropolitan by himself, but only the provincial synod under his guidance may proceed against a bishop, and only when it has been summoned legitimately, *i.e.*, *auctoritate sedis apostolicæ*. Any complaint against a bishop is rendered so difficult, that practically it

would become impossible. Like the **laity**, the **lower clergy** also are not to be admitted as accusers. Even in the case of bishops, investigation is to be made as to whether they are determined by hostile intention. Every accuser is first to attempt amicable agreement with the person to be accused, otherwise he is threatened with excommunication as a despiser of the apostles and fathers. If the accused bishop holds the judges to be liable to suspicion or hostile in feeling, he can withdraw himself from their jurisdiction, and appeal beyond the judgment of the provincial synod to the primate or the Pope. And again, the appearance of witnesses is made practically impossible, for only those who might be accusers might be witnesses, *i.e.* only the higher clergy, to the exclusion of the laity and the lower clergy, and then seventy-two such legitimate witnesses were requisite. Finally there always remains unlimited appeal to Rome. But against **violent deprivation** and expulsion, such as so often occurred under the entanglement of the bishops in secular affairs, the regulation seeks to provide that a deprived bishop must first be completely reinstalled in his rights and properties, before any charge whatever may be brought against him. It is everywhere regarded as the duty of the Pope to protect the bishops against malice and tyranny.

Naturally all these requirements only appear partly as particular and occasional, partly as frequently repeated and widely scattered requirements of the Roman bishops, not as a collected system, which would bring out much more tangibly their monstrosity compared with the existing condition of the law.

The **Capitularia** of **BENEDICTUS LEVITA**, *i.e.* the deacon of the church of Mayence under Archbishop Otgar († 847), which come into the closest contact with the Pseudo-Isidore, are asserted to be supplementary of the capitularies of the Frankish kings by Ansegis (*vid.* *MG. Capit. reg. Franc.*, ed. Boretius). This collection seems to have originated at Otgar's instigation, and to have made use of the archives of Mayence. It is only composed to a small extent of real capitularies, of similar tendency to the Pseudo-Isidore, and partly agreeing with him verbally, but is of more varied matter, with copious material for ecclesiastical legislation and discipline. Here, therefore, the author works not only by means of alleged papal letters, but by means of pretended royal-ecclesiastical legislation. To the same time and tendency belong finally the so-called **Capitula Angilrami**, alleged to have been delivered to Bishop Angilram of Metz († 791) by Pope Hadrian. They also to a large extent agree verbally or almost verbally with the two other forgeries. It may now be regarded as proved that they did not arise in Rome, Italy or the Spanish Church,¹ but in the Frankish

¹ According to F. Maassen, *Pseudoisidorstudien*, 1st and 2nd Heft, Wien 1885, one codex of the so-called Hispana exhibits a revision and recension of the text of the Hispana, which might be regarded as a preparatory study for the forgery.

Church. Seeing, therefore, that Benedict's enterprise seems to have proceeded from the church of Mayence, it was thought possible to assume origin in the East Frankish Church, especially in Mayence, for Pseudo-Isidore also. KUNST would make Benedictus Levita himself the author of the Isidore, which, however, cannot be maintained. Much in the Isidorian collection rather pointed to West-Frankish conditions, especially the diocese of Rheims, *e.g.* the polemic against the institution of regionary bishops. Following the example of WEIZÄCKER, many (Noorden, Hinschius, Dove) decided in favour of the West-Frankish origin of the collection, which moreover was said to have utilized the capitularies of Benedict. But according to WASSERSCHLEBEN, the complete Isidorian collection would have to be distinguished from a shorter form which only contained false papal letters down to Damasus (+ 384), and as neither the hypothesis that Benedict had made use of Pseudo-Isidore nor the converse seemed capable of being carried out, Wasserschleben assumed that the **older, shorter form** of the Pseudo-Isidore had originated in **Mayence** and like the capitularies of Angilram also, had been utilized by Benedict, but that the completed Isidorian collection, *viz.*, the forged letters of the popes after Damasus, which is just where the question of the regionary bishops which concerned Rheims emerges, had ensued later in the West-Frankish kingdom. He brings the origin of the older nucleus of the forgeries into intrinsic connection with the divisions of parties during the conflicts of Lewis with his sons, and therefore places it in the time, when, after the restoration of Lewis the Pious, the party of Otgar and Ebo (*i.e.* that of Lothar) desired to protect itself against the secular power and the party of the metropolitans and synods allied with it, while at the same time Otgar hoped to vindicate the ancient claims of Mayence; he therefore claims the date of 844 for this older collection (Ebo's restoration in 840, and removal to Hildesheim, 844), but for the later addition a somewhat later time (after 847). The other view now strongly championed assumes for the whole Pseudo-Isidorian collection this later date, after the year 847, in which the capitularies of Benedict seem to conclude, and regards Rheims as the seat of their origin, in which diocese a more frequent use of the Pseudo-Isidore is earliest perceptible. None of these hypotheses removes all difficulties, and so Schulte confines himself to the close connection of Benedict with Isidore, and to the assertion, that the first use is made of the latter in the affair of Ebo, and that he and his adherents were in any case closely associated with the business.¹

In the Frankish Church, Hincmar at the Synod of Rheims already shows knowledge of Pseudo-Isidore, whose forged papal letters are also made use of at the Synod of Kierzy (Feb., 857), in the synodal missive of Thoucy (Oct., 860), and elsewhere. In Rome they are made use of by Nicholas in the affair of Rothad (Mansi, XV. 676), and he appeals to the fact (*ibid.*, 695), that Frankish bishops, who controverted the validity of the false decretals, had formerly made use of them in their own interest. Hence the conjecture that it was just ROTHAD who had brought them from the diocese of Rheims to Rome, where the clergy consecrated by Ebo made use of them against HINCMAR, who was now ardent against this trap laid for the right of the metropolitan.—In the history of Nicholas I. and his next successors, the conflict of the Pseudo-Isidorian conceptions bears the imprint of those of hitherto existing ecclesiastical

¹ SIMSON has made another attempt: *die Entstehung der Pseudo-isidorianischen Fälschungen in LE MANS*. Leipzig 1886. *Vid.* on the contrary WASSERSCHLEBEN in HZ., vol. 64 (NF. 28), 234-250.

law. The episcopate very soon had cause enough to complain of the two-edgedness of the weapon which had originally been wielded in its interest, as the papacy alone reaped the fruits and found means in the Pseudo-Isidore to protect itself not only against the independence of the princes, but also against that of the episcopate and the metropolitans.

The Pseudo-Isidore did not make the mediæval papacy, but, as a strong expression of tendencies which were present and favoured by the development of history, it strengthened its advance, collected for the first time the claims which had been earlier made separately, combined with them really new claims, such as in part subsequent times did not realize, and clothed the whole with the authority of ecclesiastical tradition, and thus not unessentially contributed to the development and confirmation of papal absolutism. After those contemporaries from whom (*e.g.* Hincmar) the forgery could not be entirely concealed had passed away, the belief in its genuineness became universal, or rather, with the growth of indolence and the diminution of culture almost all opposition became silenced, although *e.g.* the famous Synod of Rheims of 991 opposed the **Isidorian principles** with decision. The false decretals were received into the larger systematic collections of canons, which then became the sources for the *Decretum Gratiani*, and so gained entrance into the *corpus juris canonici*. At the end of the Middle Ages doubts of their genuineness were audible (Nicholas of Cusa and others); then the Magdeburg Centuriators demonstrated the forgery in detail (similarly in France, De Moulin and others). The defence of the Jesuit Torres (1872) was forcibly refuted by the Calvinist David Blondel (*Pseudo-isidorus et Turrianus rapulantes*, Genevæ 1628), and even Romish scholars, especially the brothers Ballerini (*De antiquis tum editis tum ineditis collectionibus et collectoribus canonum ad Gratianum usque tractatus*, 1757), cleared up the history of ancient ecclesiastical law in such a manner that since that time, even from the Romish side, only quite isolated attempts have been made to maintain the genuineness against the force of facts, such as the last by Eduard DUMOND, *Les fausses décrétales* in the *Revue des questions historiques*, I. 392, II. 97 (1866). Another sort of exoneration of the Romish Church was tried by the Jesuit De Smedt (*vid.* on it, Wasserleben in RE. 12, 382).

3. The Papacy and Hierarchy under Nicholas I. (858-867), and his next successors, Hadrian II. (—872) and John VIII. (872-882).

Sources: NICOLAI I. *epp.* in ML., 119 cf. (COUSTANT) *de Nicolai I. epp.* in *Analecta juris pontif.* Ser. X. t. V. ps. 2, 1869; *Hadriani epp.*, ML., 122; *Joannis VIII. epp.* ML., 124. *Hincmari epp.* ed. Sirmond, 1645; ML., 125, 126. *Literature:* E. DÜMMER, *G. d. ostfr. R.* II., 2nd ed., 1887.

On the news of the death of Benedict III., the Emperor Lewis hastened to Rome to prevent an injury to his prerogative. To his influence and that of his magnates, more than to the clergy, the decision on the election of Nicholas I. is attributed,¹ and so of the man who, with good fortune, seemed to conquer for the **Bishop of Rome** the position at the head of the Christian West, which the **Christian Emperor Charles** had once occupied. The upward tendency of the papacy, which had been traceable since the time of

¹ Prudentii *annales ad annum* 858.

Lewis the Pious, culminated in Nicholas. He sought with success to free the Roman see from the imperial supreme authority, as in general he combats all interferences of the secular power in ecclesiastical affairs in the interest of the independence of the Church, but ascribes the monarchical leadership over the Church itself to the see of Rome by virtue of the prerogative of St. Peter, from which all rights of bishops and councils were first of all derived. Towards the East, also, he seeks to extend the sphere of power of the Roman Church, and to interfere decidedly in the Greek Church; and, indeed, to show himself to be the highest arbiter in the world, to be judged by none. Himself of strict morality and scientific education, mild towards obedient clergy, terrible to the refractory, he left a powerful impression on his time, and occupies one of the first places among the great types of ecclesiastical Rome.¹ In Italy, he knew how to win the people to himself by his undertakings in the common interest and his great benevolence, took the part of the oppressed, and also became the agent of the people against the nobility who were drawn into the Frankish interest. Complaints by the city of Ravenna about its bishop gave him a welcome opportunity of breaking the ancient desire of this archbishopric for independence. Nicholas called Archbishop JOHN before a Roman synod in 861, in spite of the Emperor Lewis's attempts at mediation, on account of the controversies pending, and when he did not appear, uttered the ban against him in 862, and John had finally to submit.

On occasion of various controversies in the **Frankish Empire**, the interference of the Pope showed the beginning of the activity of the new ecclesiastico-legal idea. Bishop EBO of Rheims, on account of his taking part against the Emperor Lewis the Pious, had been deposed at **Diedenhofen** (*vid.* p. 155). After the death of Lewis in 840, the Emperor **LOTHAR** had reappointed him, but when in 843 (**Verdun**) Rheims came under Charles the Bald, Ebo had to retire, and went into the service of **LOTHAR**, who exerted himself in vain with Pope Sergius for his reinstatement. After Ebo had fallen into disgrace with Lothar, Lewis the German entrusted him with the administration of the vacant bishopric of **Hildesheim**, but Hincmar, who had been raised by Charles the Bald, in agreement with the synod at Verneuil (845), to be Ebo's successor in Rheims, now deposed as illegal all clergy in the diocese of Rheims who had been conse-

¹ The idea that in his case the ceremony of coronation was first performed, rests on a misunderstanding of a passage in the *Liber Pontificalis*. *Vid.* GIESEBRECHT, *Gesch. der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, 4th ed., III., 1036.

erated by Ebo after his return and before his second expulsion, which the Synod of Soissons in 853 approved, and Pope Benedict III. confirmed, though with the prudent phrase: "If the circumstances permit." But at the same time he reserved the right of appeal to Rome, basing on the Sardicene Canon. At Hincmar's desire, Pope Nicholas now at first repeated the approval in the same modified manner as his predecessor.

Hincmar now fell into violent dissension with ROTHAD of Soissons, who was also decidedly his political opponent, and who, moreover, had secretly supported the cause of the clergy who had been consecrated by Ebo, and whose prospects were now checked. Hincmar, Rothad's metropolitan, caused him to be deposed at a synod at Soissons in 860, on account of numerous cases of refractoriness and self-will, amongst others also, because Rothad had of his own power deposed a priest who was accused of adultery, and would not reinstate him at Hincmar's request. A synod at Pistres in 862 was obliged to acknowledge Rothad's right to appeal to Rome. But Hincmar seized upon Rothad's exertions to gain the bishops directly for his cause, as a renunciation of the appeal; and, while Rothad was imprisoned by the king, caused the Synod of Soissons¹ to confirm the deposition. Nicholas, on the other hand, at first required the reinstatement of Rothad, and summoned him and his opponents, represented by at least two or three bishops from the synod, before his tribunal at Rome. The Synod of Verbery determined to send Rothad to Rome, and as a matter of fact he had the fortune to escape thither and lay his complaints before the Pope. But the episcopal accusers remained absent, and without further delay Nicholas invested him on Christmas eve, 864, with the episcopal robe, himself reinstated him a few weeks later as Bishop of Soissons, and required Hincmar to reinstate Rothad under threat of deposition. This is the first indubitable papal attempt to ground upon the principles of the new ecclesiastical law according to Pseudo-Isidore; obedience was due to all papal decrees; without the command of the Pope, no synod was to be held; all *causæ majores* (*viz.* those relating to bishops) were to be reserved to the decision of the curia. Hincmar complained² of the injuriousness of the papal interference with the archiepiscopal administration and the rights of the bishops, but had actually to reinstate Rothad in 865.

The priests consecrated by Ebo now also demanded their restoration and new investigation with the participation of outside

¹ In the suburbs, not in Senlis, *vid.* Hefele, 4, 258.

² Hincmar, *opp.*, II. 244 sqq. Cf. Flodoardi *hist. Remensis eccl.*, III. 12-14.

metropolitans (*viz.* the opponents of Hincmar, Remigius of Lyons and Ado of Vienne). That might cost Hincmar his archiepiscopal position. For if they were legally priests, Ebo had been illegally expelled by Charles the Bald, and Hincmar was an intruder. But the Synod of Soissons, in 866, declared the deposition of those priests to be legal, and only recommended their re-appointment out of mercy. Nicholas at that time required the help of the Frankish Church in conflict with the Greek, and took conciliatory steps. But when Hincmar had drawn down on himself the disfavour of Charles the Bald, Nicholas again took up the matter, aiming at Hincmar's complete ruin and a decisive victory of the papal authority. But at this point Nicholas died; and his successor, Hadrian II., who was friendly disposed towards the powerful Hincmar, settled the matter in the sense of the synod, seeing that Ebo's affair could no longer be fully cleared up.

Nicholas, basing on the vocation of the Church as protectress of moral order, also successfully opposed the secular authorities, and the prelates who were subservient to their interests, in the well-known **affair of the marriage of Lothar II. of Lorraine.**

The latter had lived in his youth with his lover, Waldrada; but soon after his father's death, under the stress of political considerations, had married Thietberga, the sister of the powerful and immoral Abbot Hucbert of St. Maurice, the most influential man in Burgundy. But as early as 857 he sought to get rid of her, accusing her of grave offences, and again lived with Waldrada. He gained the Archbishops GÜNTHER of Cologne, and THIETGAUD of Trèves, and on the ground of a confession of guilt which was forced from her at a synod at Aix-la-Chapelle, in which a few Burgundian and West-Frankish bishops also took part, Thietberga was condemned to public monastic penance and monastic confinement. Thietberga, however, fled to Charles the Bald, who willingly took her part against Lothar, and appealed here as she had already done, to the Pope. From the West-Frankish kingdom Hincmar raised his voice (*De divortio Lothari*) against the divorce. Lothar also, and the Lotharingian bishops, applied humbly to the Pope. But Lothar, at the same time, was skilful enough to win over his Lotharingian bishops by exaggerated exaltation of their spiritual supreme power, to approbation of a new marriage with Waldrada, whose wedding and coronation ensued in spite of the prohibition of Nicholas. He had, however, intimidated by the threatening attitude of his two uncles, Charles and Lewis the German, to submit to a fresh investigation of the affair at the Synod of 858, summoned to Metz by Nicholas. Here, however, the two legates of the Pope, RHODOALD of Porto, and JOHN of Ficulna, allowed themselves to be gained by bribery. Partly they did not present the papal missive at all, partly they falsified it; and silenced in this way, the synod confirmed the former decision, and under the impression, which was fortified by the legates, that they would obtain the papal confirmation, they sent Günther of Cologne, and Thietgaud of Trèves, themselves to Rome to carry out the affair there. But Nicholas annulled the Metz decisions, excommunicated his own legates, one of whom, Rhodoald had already shown himself

venal in the mission to Constantinople (on the affair of Photius), deposed the two German bishops, and offered the other participators pardon only on condition of their subjection to Rome. This was certainly an entirely new method of procedure, to depose bishops without the consent of the king, and without consulting a provincial court; but in doing so he had the public conscience on his side, and the bishops were silent. Lothar's brother, the Emperor Lewis II., now advanced on Rome with troops, and with the assent and participation of all the Italian opponents of the Pope; it came to a collision in 864, and the two guilty archbishops deposited a protest on the tomb of St. Peter. GÜNTHER then returned to his archbishopric in spite of the excommunication. But the inflexibility of Nicholas did not fail of its moral impression on the Emperor. Lewis II., especially at the instance of his wife, took conciliatory steps towards the Pope, and Lothar, in his political embarrassment, let his helpers drop, and humbled himself in the most humiliating terms, and even called the Pope to his protection. The Lotharingian bishops submitted themselves to the Pope, and Lothar entrusted another bishop with the administration of Cologne in the interim, as Nicholas had reserved to himself the final decision. The papal legate, Arsenius, who, on the Pope's commission, at the same time brought Bishop Rothad of Soissons to France, and brought letters of the Pope to Charles, Hincmar, etc., simply announcing the re-instatement of Rothad, took Thietberga in charge and brought her to Lothar, to whom, moreover, ecclesiastical penance for his adultery was remitted, and by commission of the Pope was to bring about an entire reconciliation of the three Frankish rulers. Charles the Bald and Lewis the German, whose quarrels had at that time been reconciled (February, 865) at Thoussy (Thusiacum, in the diocese of Toul), did, indeed, declare against Lothar's marriage, and promised to persuade him to virtue by their ambassadors; but they declined the plan of Nicholas, of sending bishops from all the Frankish kingdoms to a synod at Rome. The three Frankish kings began to recognize the common danger which threatened them from Rome through the ambitious interference of Nicholas. But Lothar again received Waldrada, who was to have been brought to Italy, but escaped on the way and defied the Pope, who now uttered the ban against Waldrada (not against Lothar). The Pope remained inflexible, although Thietberga herself now begged for divorce. Thietgaud and Günther in vain exerted themselves with the Pope for restitution, supported by the intercessions of the Synod of Paris in 865. Günther returned to Cologne, and King Lothar once more made over the archbishopric to him. He, indeed, refrained from the spiritual functions of his office, but practically administered his archbishopric, although formally Hilduin (perhaps his brother), who had previously been commissioned for the purpose, exercised the office of vicegerent. He was able, by very favourable bargains with the cathedral chapter, to win it to his side. Nicholas died (13th November, 867) before the settlement of the controversy.

For the success with which Nicholas vindicated his claims in Constantinople (against Photius) *vid. infra*, chap. vi. Regard to the conflict with the Greek Church, in which he desired to have the whole West behind him, appears finally to have restrained him from further measures against Lothar, which might also have stirred up the Emperor. At the same time he also made friendly approaches to the so bitterly opposed Hincmar in the autumn of 867, inasmuch as through him (Ep. in Mansi, XV. 3557) and Charles the Bald, he summoned the whole West-Frankish Church, as likewise Lewis the German and the German bishops, to the defence against the attacks of the Greeks.

Hadrian II. now ascended the papal throne, for which he had already been kept in view on occasion of previous vacancies. The Roman and the Franko-Imperial parties united on him, now of venerable age. In the triumph over the Greek Church (general Synod of 869-70), he reaped what Nicholas had sown, but for the rest certainly inherited Nicholas's claims, but not his force and consistency and good fortune. He at first came forward as a conciliator, as was shown by the settlement of the controversy in regard to the Rheims clergy, and in general by his friendly advances towards Hincmar, but professed the principles of Nicholas, which he also sought to maintain in the affair of the marriage.

He refused King Lothar the divorce which Thietberga herself now also begged for, but proposed a still further reinvestigation, and so did not *a priori* cut off the prospect of a different turn of the event. Lothar II. came himself to Italy, and through the intercession of Engelberga, the wife of the Emperor Lewis, obtained a meeting with the Pope in Monte Casino. At the intercession of the Emperor he loosed Waldrada from the ban of the Church, under the condition that she should immediately renounce all intercourse with Lothar, communicated this to the Frankish bishops, and dissuaded Lewis and Charles from attacks on Lothar. At the assembly at Monte Casino an oration was held in Hadrian's presence, which is designated **the first comprehensive vindication of the Pseudo-Isidorian principles**. On the sworn assurance of Lothar and his retinue, that since his reacceptance of Thietberga he had refrained from all intercourse with Waldrada (an obvious perjury), the Pope himself gave him the sacrament. To Günther also, who at that time resigned his archbishopric, he then gave the Holy Supper. In Rome, however, he treated Lothar with visible disrespect, and when the latter suddenly died at Piacenza (869) on his return journey, there was a universal impression that it was a divine judgment.

When Charles the Bald now made himself master of Lorraine and had himself crowned in Metz, Hadrian took the side of the legitimate heir, the Emperor LEWIS II. But his interference was decidedly repelled by Charles the Bald. HINCMAR, while protesting his devotion, replied to the Pope, that the king, the bishops and magnates of the realm regarded his interference in secular affairs as an unheard of presumption; he could not be both bishop and king. A threatening reply of Hadrian's remained without effect. Against Lewis the German, who likewise sought to obtain possession of his share of the inheritance of Lothar, and who had immediately taken possession of the archbishopric of Cologne, the Pope took up a much more friendly attitude, being deceived by his conciliatory expressions. Hadrian was unable to prevent the coming into existence of the Treaty of Meerssen (870), and he threatened in vain that he would come to Frankfort in person.

Passionate, but equally fruitless, was Hadrian's interference in favour of Carlmann, the posthumous son of Charles the Bald.

In another matter he likewise experienced a decided rebuff. Hincmar of Rheims had made his nephew of the same name Bishop of Laon (858), but had fallen into violent dissension with him, a man of self-willed and intriguing character. The nephew began, founding on the Pseudo-Isidore, to encroach on the metropolitan rights of his uncle, and received support in his action from Pope Hadrian. The elder Hincmar, who had himself formerly made use of many of the false decretals, now turned as metropolitan decidedly against the legal validity of these principles, and a synod at Attigny in 870 decided in his sense. When the younger Hincmar showed partizanship for the plans of Carlmann, and refused to subscribe to the excommunication decreed against Carlmann's associates in January, 871, he was deposed at a synod summoned by the king at **Doucy** near Sedan, in spite of his appeal to the Pope. The resolutions of the synod, which did not deny him appeal to the Pope in accordance with the older law of the Church in the sense of the Sardicene Canon, were sent to the Pope for confirmation. Hadrian II. loftily commanded (*vid.* Jaffé, 3945) that Hincmar of Laon and a suitable accuser should be sent to Rome for examination. At this the synod expressed their astonishment, and continued to stand by the ancient point of view.¹ Hincmar replied in the name of the king, in a very blunt fashion, appealing to Charles's dignity as a Christian and a king: the Kings of the Franks were not *episcoporum vicedomini, sed terræ domini*. He deprecates such letters in the future and casts pretty plain side-glances at the new decretals. The Pope actually gave way in humble fashion, praised the king's deserts of the Church, represented his former letters as surreptitiously obtained, and enticed Charles with the prospect of the Imperial crown if he should survive Lewis II. HINCMAR of Laon, if he persisted in his refusal, was to be called before a provincial court, without previous reinstatement. Thus he was here again obliged to allow the validity of the old legal view of the Frankish Church. Hincmar, so seriously threatened under Nicholas, stood at the climax of his power, and after Hadrian's death in 872, John VIII. also confirmed the Synod of Doucy. But Hincmar of Laon was subsequently blinded by Charles the Bald on account of treasonable alliances with the German court.

John VIII. prosecuted the aims of Nicholas with rather more

¹ *Vid.* DELALANDE, *Conciliorum gallicorum supplem.*, pp. 274-282, more complete than in Mansi.

good-fortune than Hadrian, but without the moral greatness of Nicholas, with the weapons of intrigue and by utilizing the weakness of the Carolingians and the confused political conditions, from which, however, he himself finally suffered. After the death of the Emperor Lewis II., Charles the Bald immediately hastened across the Alps, with a view to obtaining the imperial crown in opposition to the nearer claims of Lewis the German. On his way, while he was dealing with the son of Lewis the German, who advanced against him, the ambassador of the Pope already invited him to come to Rome. Seventy-five years after the imperial coronation of Charles, at Christmas, 875, he received the crown from the hand of the Pope, and he afterwards acknowledged that he owed it entirely to the papal appointment and election.¹ The imperial dignity now appeared to be no longer hereditary, but conferred by grace of the Pope, and there was no longer any trace of vindication of the Frankish supremacy over Rome, although the Pope in his political embarrassments by the Saracens and the Italian parties appealed to the protection of the Emperor—mostly, indeed, in vain. The consequence of the altered conditions was, that the **Lombard Kingdom**, hitherto the hereditary possession of the Carolingians, became a hereditary monarchy. At a great assembly of spiritual and secular lords in 876, Charles was elected King of Italy, after the Pope had invited him and created him Emperor.

In the Frankish kingdoms, John sought, in accordance with an agreement entered into with Charles in Rome, to interfere through Archbishop ANSEGIS of Sens, as his Vicar or Primate, in the sense of the Pseudo-Isidore, from which Charles, on his side, hoped also to have influence on the West-Frankish kingdom also. But not only was the intended extension of the claims of Ansegis on Germany not attained, but even in the Frankish kingdom the Synod of Ponthion in 876 declared its obedience only under reservation of the rights of metropolitans, in favour of which Hincmar stepped in, in the treatise *De jure metropolitanorum ad episcopos*. After the deaths of Lewis the German in 876, and Charles the Bald in 877, the embarrassments of the Pope increased. JOHN, being hard pressed by LANTBERT of Spoleto, was obliged to flee for protection and assistance to Boso of Provence and LEWIS the Stammerer. But CHARLES the Fat, in alliance with the German party in Upper Italy (Anspert, Bishop of Milan), compelled the Pope to

¹ On the doubtful gift of Capua to the Pope by Charles, *vid.* HIRSCH in the *Forschungen*, XX. 133, 152.

drop Count Boso of Provence, who had erected the independent kingdom of ARLES, and instead to raise himself to the emperorship in 881. John died by the hand of an assassin in 882; and at the same time with him, Hincmar, on flight before the Normans, who, having long been the terror of the West-Frankish and other Carolingian kingdoms by their invasions, now settled in Normandy. Soon thereafter CHARLES the Fat once more united in his own hand all the parts of the Carolingian heritage, but this was a faint shadow of the Carolingian Empire, and for it the Pope fell into the hands of the Italian parties.

4. The Papacy and the Hierarchy down to the Deposition of John XII. in 963.

Sources:—The papal letters in *MI.* 129 (Stephen V., sqq.), *MI.* 131 (Joh. IX., sqq.), *MI.* 132 (Joh. X., sqq.), *MI.* 133 (Marinus sqq.), LIUTPRANDI *Antapodosis* in *MGS.* V. and *Serg.* I., 2nd ed., ed. Dümmler, Hann. 1877. *AUXILIUS* opp. *MI.* 129, and the writings of Auxilius and Vulgar. in Dümmler, *Auxil. u. Vulgar.*, Lpz. 1866. E. Dümmler, *Gesta Berengarii*, Halle 1871. *Literature*: *Jb. d. R.* E. DÜMMLER, *G. d. ostfr. R.*, 2nd ed., vol. 3. *Die letzten Karolinger, Konrad I.*, 1880. WAITZ, *Jb. d. R. unter Heinrich I.*, 3rd. ed., 1885. KÖPKE u. DÜMMLER, *Otto d. Gr.*, 1876. V. E. LÖSCHER, *G. d. röm. Hurenregiments*, Lpz. 1708 (2nd ed., *Gesch. der mittleren Zeiten als ein Licht in der Finsterniss*, 1725).

1. The deposition of the incapable CHARLES the Fat (887), and the election as German king of ARNULPH of Carinthia, the natural son of the German Carlmann, loosed the bond between France, Italy and Germany. As in France the different princes and pretenders stood opposed to each other, so also in Italy did the dynasties, especially the Dukes WIDO of Spoleto and BERENGAR of Friuli, and the popes found themselves completely involved in the Italian party conflicts. STEPHEN V. (885–891), elected without the influence of Charles the Fat, after the latter's deposition crowned WIDO of Spoleto Emperor (891). Pope Formosus (891–896), who formerly as Bishop of Porto and Papal Legate had taken a vigorous part in the negotiations with the Greek Church regarding Bulgaria, had then been excommunicated, from political motives, by Pope John VIII., but restored again by Marinus one of his short-reigned successors, was the first pope who was elevated from another episcopal see to that of Rome. WIDO compelled him to crown his son LANTBERT (Lambert) as co-emperor. But Formosus then sought help against this tyranny at home from the German king ARNULPH, who, in 894, and again in 896, not to the satisfaction of the German magnates and clergy, appeared in Italy, and after overcoming Lambert received the imperial crown from the Pope and the oath of **fidelity** from the

Romans, naturally with reservation of their honours and rights and their obligations to the Pope.

The elevation of the succeeding popes, who mostly reigned only for a short time, exhibits a continuous party warfare between the German and Italian parties, which thought shame of no expedient. **STEPHEN VI.**, elevated by the Spoletan party, conducted the scandalous process against the corpse of **Formosus**, which he caused to be exhumed and invested with the pontifical robes, with a view to accusing **Formosus** before a synod, nominally because out of sinful ambition he had exchanged his bishopric of Porto for that of Rome, in reality, it is probable, because of his relations with **Arnulph**. **Formosus**, whose defence a deacon was obliged to undertake, was declared to be an illegitimate pope, and his decrees and consecrations null. The priestly garb was then stripped from the body, and the finger with which he was accustomed to bless, hacked off, and the corpse was thrown into the Tiber. **Stephen** himself found a violent end, as did his next short-reigned successors. A pope, **SERGIVS III.**, arose, but did not attain recognition. **JOHN IX.** (898-900) restored the honour of **Formosus** at a Roman synod in 898, at which all who had participated in the affair had to offer apologies, and reinstated those who had been consecrated by **Formosus**. The acts of the process he caused to be burned. But, at the same time, he had to confirm **LAMBERT's** emperorship against **ARNULPH**, acknowledge the imperial right to make trial of the papal election, and tolerate the imperial jurisdiction of **Lambert** in Rome. **Lambert** died in 898, **Arnulph** in 899.

In Germany, **Arnulph's** son, **LEWIS the Child** (till 911), the last of the Carolingian blood, was now raised to the throne, and it was especially the exertions of Archbishop **HATTO** of Mayence, and the higher clergy in general, which restrained the dominant factions (the aspirations of the dukedoms towards separation). But in Italy **BERENGAR** of Friuli opposed **LEWIS III.** of Arles, who had been invited by the Spoletan party and crowned Emperor by Pope **Benedict IV.** (900-903). Meanwhile the mastery of the condition of affairs at Rome and the papacy was obtained by the local parties, especially that of the Margrave **ADALBERT** of Tuscany, the centre of which was formed by a Roman lady of senatorial family, the notorious **THEODORA**, with her daughters **MAROTIA** and **THEODORA**. The papacy became the spoil and the plaything of the immoral nobility. This so-called Roman **pornocracy** begins with the re-elevation of the already mentioned **Sergius III.** (904-911). At a Roman synod he declared himself again against the validity of the

consecrations bestowed by Formosus, the subjects of which were obliged to be consecrated anew, and by threats and bribery carried through the recognition of this principle of confusion to the Church. He was succeeded by ANASTASIUS III., then by LANDO, finally by JOHN X. (914-928) elevated by the favour of Theodora. The last-named succeeded with the help of Berengar, Lando of Benevento and the Greeks, in expelling the Arabs who had settled on the Garigliano, in doing which the Pope took part in person. Previously he had made King Berengar Emperor (915), probably in order not to be powerless in the hands of those who had elevated him; but his attempts to act with greater independence cost him his freedom and probably his life; he is said to have been smothered in 929 at the instigation of Marozia. JOHN XI., the son of Marozia by Pope Sergius, as at least Liutprand asserts, ascended the papal throne in 931, while his half-brother ALBERIC (born of the marriage of Marozia with Alberic of Camerino), as *Patricius* and *Senator* possessed himself of the secular government of Rome, which he essentially vindicated (932-954), after expelling his stepfather, the third husband of Marozia, Duke Hugo of Provence (King of Italy, after the overthrow of Rudolph of Burgundy) and his mother herself. John XI. was taken prisoner, once more set free, and died in 936. The succeeding popes under Alberic's rule only retained the ecclesiastical administration.¹ But Alberic's son OCTAVIAN, who, while still very young, inherited his power over Rome, and at the same time at the inducement of Alberic was elected coadjutor to Agapetus, after the death of Agapetus, in 956, ascended the papal throne as JOHN XII., and at the same time disgraced it by his excesses.

2. Under the conditions depicted a consistent carrying out of the ideas of Nicholas I., was not to be conceived of till the middle of the tenth century. The need of calling in the help of the papal authority as divine, in the solution of conflicts which seemed otherwise insoluble, only showed itself incidentally in the party conflicts of the time. Thus John VIII. had been obliged to release the Emperor Lewis II. from an oath, and Charles the Fat wished to make use of Hadrian III., to declare his illegitimate son Bernard legitimate. But neither those claims of the Roman see to appear in secular affairs as the supreme arbiter, nor the interference in the ecclesiastical affairs of the different national Churches to which Nicholas in his own time had successfully aspired, could be otherwise than merely incidentally vindicated. In general the richly

¹ Leo VI., Stephen VIII., Marinus II., Agapetus († 956).

endowed higher clergy, who, especially in Germany, had also a decisive influence on the affairs of the Empire, sought to maintain their rights even against the Pope.

The Synod of Tribur (895), led by HATTO of Mayence, was the first larger synod in Germany for half a century which tried to restore ecclesiastical order and the sunken ecclesiastical discipline and to vindicate the authority of the bishops as against the secular officials also. In order to strengthen the influence of the Church and protect the clergy against laymen in general, the bishops in many cases appealed to passages in the Pseudo-Isidore; they also declared themselves to owe obedience to the Pope, but not without side-glances at the fact that he desired to impose an insufferable yoke; and they oppose the tendency of the lower clergy to make crafty use of the papal authority against their bishops.¹

In the succeeding times of Lewis the Child it was the first clergy of the Empire (HATTO of Mayence and ADALBERT of Augsburg) who along with OTTO Duke of the Saxons conducted the government of the Empire; and while SOLOMON of Constance also exercised the greatest influence, certainly cared for themselves and the increase of the Church, and watched zealously over the rights of the German archbishoprics.² Bishops and abbots were in this age more and more endowed with royalties and immunities, while, it is true, the property of the Church formed the favourite object of attack in the conflict of the magnates. When, after the death of the last Carolingian, the Frank CONRAD I. was made German king in 911, and had immediately trouble in maintaining the unity of the Empire against the newly arising provincial dukes (of Bavaria and Swabia), after the death of Otto, the old Duke of the Saxons, it was especially the heads of the German Church (Hatto, then Heriger of Mayence, Solomon of Constance, etc.) who had the ear of the king and protected the monarchy against the powerful nobility, certainly in the proper interest of the Church and Church-property. For the provincial dukes had specially come to the front by the spoliation of the rich spiritual foundations; dependents were maintained by monastic property and vassals increased in number, lay-abbots frequently occur, bishoprics are bestowed and sold by family interest. At that time (916) the synod at Hohenaltheim, not far from Nordlingen, was held, in order "to give the tottering monarchy a support in the Church."³ Peter of Ortona, a legate of Pope John X., opened the assembly. They were "to root out the devil's seed, which had arisen in this land, and bring to nought the godless machinations of perverse persons," by which not only the revolt of the dukes against Conrad, but also the deeds of violence and the spoliations of the Church which were connected with it, are to be understood. The episcopal duties, but also rights, were inculcated, among them the *exceptio spoli* (*vid. supra*, p. 162). Lower clergy are subject to episcopal, not to lay, courts. Laymen who obstinately refuse the tithe are to be laid under excommunication. Accusations against bishops are the business of the provincial synod, but *after* its judgment there is still freedom of appeal to Rome.

¹ *Vid.* Mansi, XVIII. 131 sqq. and in addition Phillips in SBWA. 1865 and Hefele, VI. 552 sqq.

² *Vid. sup.* the controversy about Hamburg, p. 139 sq., the resistance to the detachment of Moravia from the German ecclesiastical alliance, and the championship of the rights of the diocese of Salzburg in the Slavonic East.

³ The complete minute of the synod in MGL. II. 554 sqq.

There is no question here of the papal claims which, according to the Pseudo-Isidore, go beyond the canon of Sardica. The Saxon bishops, who, in spite of the invitation to the synod, had not appeared, were censured (canon 30) and once more invited; in case they should not appear they were to be prohibited by the legates and this synod from reading mass, till they should go to Rome and answer for themselves before the Pope. A solemn declaration, against rebellion against the king and the killing and putting to violence of spiritual persons accompanying it, is attached.

When the monarchy had passed to the Saxon HENRY I. (919-936), he in proud modesty declined **anointment** and **coronation** by Archbishop HERIGER of Mayence, which the clergy for long did not forget against him. However, the German Church had no cause to complain of him. Naturally, apart from Bavaria, where he had still cause to spare the similar claims of Duke Arnulph, he mostly appointed the bishops himself, which right no one contested with him, and Pope John expressly acknowledged.¹ He invested the bishops, and they were obliged to offer him the oath of fealty and furnish the requisite militia. We find the prelates regularly present in the campaigns of the tenth century. But after he had in the first place established peace in the Empire, he also sought, not without success, to heal the wounds with which the Church had been smitten. The bishoprics which had suffered detriment in the matter of property (less of course the monasteries) recovered themselves. Synods were held for the establishment of ecclesiastical order and the celebration of festivals; naturally, care was also taken for the settlement of the limits of ecclesiastical power. Before the decisive battle against the Hungarians in 933, Henry is besides said to have vowed to renounce the ancient abuse of simony which was so closely involved with the political and social importance of bishoprics and abbacies. As a matter of fact, just as in France and Italy, the bestowal of spiritual appointments, especially by the hands of smaller princes, because it was also the conferring of benefices, often took place out of purely secular, frequently out of quite unworthy considerations (to favourites, creatures, even children), and positions were often actually sold.

After Henry's death the Empire and the papacy came into peculiar relationship through OTTO I. (936-973) who was solemnly crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle by Archbishop Heribert of Mayence. In the first grievous years, full of conflicts with the dukes and his brother Henry, we see bishops also, among them Frederick of Mayence, the first bishop of the Empire, on the side of the enemies of his powerful rule. He desired to make the monarchy and the dukes balance each other. Even before the Roman campaigns, Otto was on one occasion able to interfere in a peculiar way in the **ecclesiastical** relations of France. In the controversy over the archbishopric of Rheims, Otto supported his brother-in-law LEWIS IV. (Transmarinus) against Duke HUGO of Francia; after a bloody and victorious feud, Otto, with the consent of Pope Agapetus II., at the Synod of **Ingelheim** in 948, which was almost solely attended by German bishops, caused ARTOLD, who had previously been

¹ *Vid.* John's letter to Archbishop Hermann of Cologne. Jaffé, 3564.

expelled by his opponents, to be recognised as archbishop, and his rival to be excommunicated. Of French bishops only Artold and two of his suffragans were present.¹

After confirming the royal power and extending and establishing the frontiers of the Empire, Otto turned against Italy, called in by AGAPETUS and the Italian magnates against BERENGAR II. (951). At that time, when he married ADELHEID, the widow of King Hugo who was oppressed by BERENGAR, Rome, where Alberic ruled, remained closed to him. Agapetus was obliged, probably out of regard to Alberic, to decline Otto's offer to come to Rome. Moreover his further plans were crossed by the revolt of his son Ludolph, who was leagued with Duke Conrad and Archbishop Frederick of Mayence. To this danger there was attached that which was threatened by the Hungarians till the victory at Lechfeld (955).

In 953 Otto had made his brother Brun Archbishop of Cologne, a most important force for the establishment of ecclesiastical order and the promotion of the culture of the clergy. The combination of the Dukedom of Lotharingia with the Archbishopric of Cologne in one hand, a kind of personal union, was peculiar. After Frederick's death Otto gave Mayence to his natural son William in 954, Trèves to his cousin Henry in 956. He thus here allowed the interest of blood-relationship to rule, but certainly, for the good of the order of the Empire, and for the security of the condition of affairs, which was also advantageous to the Church.

Pope JOHN XII., hard pressed by Berengar II., now appealed to Otto I. for help. The latter advanced on Rome, gave the Pope a sworn promise of the security² of his person and the preservation of the heritage of Peter, and had himself crowned by the Pope (2nd Feb. 962) along with his wife Adelheid. Otto laid claim to the imperial power in the sense of Charlemagne, referring to the regulation of the *Constitutio Romana* of 824, that the consecration of a pope should not take place till he had rendered the solemn oath in the presence of the royal emissaries. But he confirmed the Roman See in its possessions on the ground of the donation of Pippin, and its extensions, while adding a few cities.³ At a synod held in S.

¹ Synodal minute in MGL. II. 19 sqq. cf. FLODOARDI *H. eccl. Rem.* 4, 35 and the Annals on 948 in MI. 135.

² The verbal form of this oath, proffered by Otto through his representatives, best found in Jaffé BrG. II. 588. On the meaning of the oath Waitz. D. V. G. V., 2. VI., 177 3rd ed.

³ On Otto's **Privilegium** of the year 962, which carries on the series of the earlier privileges of Pippin (754), Charlemagne (774), and Lewis the Pious (817), and is succeeded later by that of Henry II. (1020), *vid.* FICKER, *Forschun-*

Peter's, John confirmed Otto's plans in reference to the archbishopric of Magdeburg which was to be founded, and made various arrangements regarding German bishops in accordance with Otto's desire. At Easter, 962, a synod was held in his presence at **Pavia**, at which Otto made numerous presents and conferred numerous rights to bishops and monasteries, with a view to finding support from the hitherto much oppressed bishops, and generally disposed of matters as the lord of the land in Italy. But when the Pope, contrary to his given promise, again entered into intrigue with Adalbert, Berengar's son, against Otto, the latter returned to Rome in November 963; the Pope and Adalbert fled, the Romans were obliged to renew the oath of fealty and promise never to elect a pope without the consent of the emperor or his son. At a **Synod in S. Peter's** John XII. was now deposed and Leo VIII. elevated. Rome indeed once more revolted, John returned, and after his death which ensued shortly thereafter, the Romans set up **BENEDICT V.** as anti-Pope. But in May, 964, Otto entered Rome for the third time and reinstated Leo. **The ancient relationship of the Empire to the papacy and the Roman-Italian rule seemed to be established.**

The alleged **Constitutio Leonis VIII.**, in a shorter version in MGL. II. B. 177 and in Watterich, I. 675 sqq., in another largely variant form in FLOSS, *Die Papstwahlen unter den Ottonen*, 1858, p. 147 sqq. (also in Watterich. I. 683), alleged to have originated at the Roman synod which deposed Benedict V., concedes to the Emperor Otto and his successors the choice of their own successors as well as the appointing of the popes. This document, which in its first form is generally abandoned, is also spurious in the second form, which is defended by Floss. At most, an attempt has been made to save a genuine nucleus, in which the Roman right of election is abolished (*vid.* RE. VIII. 572 and DÜMLER, *Otto d. Gr.*, I. 365). Still another fabricated document exists, in which the pope gives back all his donations to the emperor.

5. The Papacy, the Ottos and the French Church down to the deaths of Otto III. and Gerbert.

Sources : The letters of the popes concerned, ML. 134, 135, 137, 139, the important letters of GERBERT in his Opp. ed. by Olleris, Par. 1867 (ML. 137) and on more recent MS. foundation by J. HAVET, *Lettres de Gerb.* (983-997), Paris, Picard 1889. The Acts of the Synod of Rheims (Mansi, XIX. 1079), also MGS. III. 658.

Literature : WILMANS, *Jb. d. d. R. unter Otto III.* 1840. HOCK, Gerbert, 1837. WERNER, *Gerbert von Aur.* 1878. HÖFLER, *d. dtsh. Päpste*, I., Regensb. 1839.

John XIII., who was elected after the death of Leo VIII., in the presence of

gen zur Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte Italiens, II. MARTENS, *Neue Erörterungen über die römische Frage*, etc., 1882 and TH. SICKEL, *Das Privilegium Otto I.* etc. Innsbruck 1883.

Otto's commissioners, was kept prisoner by the Roman party of independence, till Otto once more appeared in Rome (966) and executed a terrible judgment. In the following year, at the ecclesiastical assembly held at Ravenna, the city and district of Ravenna were restored to the Pope, but with reservation of the sovereign supremacy of the Emperor. Soon thereafter Otto II. was crowned in Rome. After the death of Otto I. in 973 there arose in Rome the so-called Tuscan party, with CRESCENTIUS at its head, the son of the younger Theodora. Pope BENEDICT VI. was imprisoned by this party and strangled by Boniface VII. whom they elevated. Boniface, however, could not maintain himself, and fled with the whole treasure of the Church to Constantinople; the imperial party elevated Benedict VII. (974-983), who found protection from Otto II., when he after the end of the German wars came to Italy and (981) to Rome. After his unsuccessful wars against the Saracens in Lower Italy, Otto II. survived to see his son, the three-year-old Otto III. acknowledged at the Diet of Verona as German and Italian King, and also, after the death of Benedict VII. to establish John XIV. as pope. After his early death in 983, Boniface VII. returned, but found a violent end at the hands of John XIV., who soon after was likewise murdered. The younger Crescentius had obtained the patriciate and consulate of Rome and dominated the new pope, John XV. In Germany the exertions of Archbishop Willigis of Mayence were successful in maintaining the rule of the child Otto III. under the regency of his Greek mother Theophano against the endeavours of his relation, the deposed Henry II. of Bavaria.

But in **France**, after the death of King Lothar (986) and his childless son Lewis V. (987), with the co-operation of the German Empress and the powerful Archbishop ADALBERO of Rheims, the Carolingian Charles of Lotharingia was passed over, and Duke HUGO of Francia (CAPET) was raised to be king, and crowned by the Archbishop of Rheims, who shortly thereafter was obliged to crown his son Robert also. Alongside of Adalbero of Rheims, who was most deeply involved in this secular transaction, stood GERBERT, born at Aurillac in Auvergne, a man of humble origin. He had been educated in the Latin monastic school at Aurillac, had come as a young man to Spain, with Count Borel of Barcelona, and had there received the elements of higher culture from Bishop Hatto of Vich in Catalonia. He had next come in the retinue of the Margrave to Italy, been brought by Pope John XIII. into contact with the Emperor Otto, and had then gone to Rheims with an archdeacon of Rheims, attracted by his dialectic culture. For ten years he taught in the school of the chapter, and at the same time, as Adalbero's secretary was drawn by him into the movements of politics. Having come to Italy in 980 with his archbishop, he received from Otto II., before whom he had occasion to exhibit his learning, the rich abbacy of Bobbio, which, however, in these wild times had much degenerated. Thereby he was drawn into the conflict of Italian interests, till, after the death of Otto II., he was obliged to leave Italy and return to his relations with Adalbero,

who, in close relation to the Regent Theophano, was occupied in preserving the Empire for Otto III., and at the same time Lotharingia for the Empire, against the efforts of Lothar of France and Henry of Bavaria. Then, when the death of Lothar and that of Lewis had been followed by that of Adalbero also (June, 989), Hugh Capet obtained the mastery of the important Rheims, made the citizens take the oath, but conceded them the right of freely electing a new archiepiscopal master, and guided their choice to a cleric, ARNULF of Laon, a Carolingian bastard, who, formerly Hugh's opponent, had known how to gain him over. But, once raised to the see of Rheims, Arnulf immediately betrayed the city to his relation, Charles of Lower Lotharingia, allowed himself to be apparently surprised and taken prisoner, and then openly took the side of Charles. GERBERT, whose own hopes of the see of Rheims had been thwarted by Hugh, after hesitating at first, nevertheless took Hugh's side, who, in association with a French synod, accused ARNULF before Pope John XV. of perjury. The Pope hesitated to meddle with the matter, but Hugh gained over the suffragan bishops of Rheims to his side, gained possession of the persons of Charles of Lotharingia and Archbishop Arnulf, and tried the latter for his life at the remarkable Synod of Rheims.¹ From the very beginning ARNULF was here promised intercession for his life in case he should be found guilty; but the accusation discovered his faithless proceedings. In his defence a few abbots, among them the esteemed ABBO of Fleury, vindicated the ecclesiastico-legal principles of Isidore; the accused ought first to be reinstated in his dignity: the matter belonged to Rome: the canonical forms had not been observed. But the bold speech of Bishop Arnulf of Orleans, which betrayed the tendencies of King Hugh, called to mind the frightful corruption and the dependence and faithlessness of the Roman see in the tenth century. Were the god-fearing priests of the whole world to obey such monsters as Octavian (John XII.)! If it were not for the tension between Hugh and the German government, application might be made to the German clergy, instead of to Rome, where everything was to be bought. Arnulf's affair had already been laid before the Pope, but had remained without response. But the older canons give the provincial synod the right of judging independently over bishops. Rome was to blame for the decay of the Church. Thus a **revolt from Rome** and a **free development of a national Church** seemed almost to be contemplated.

¹ *Vid.* the Acts, by Gerbert's own hand, in Mansi, XIX. 107 sqq. and MGS. III. 658.

Arnulf had to admit his guilt, lay aside the priestly insignia in church in presence of the assembled people, and on his knees beseech Hugh Capet for pardon. In the deed of resignation he renounced all demand for the restoration of the see and all appeal. GERBERT was elevated in his place, and in the profession which he made, only gave prominence to the ancient foundations of the Church, and passed over the relation to Rome.

In Germany, however, there was discontent with the bold procedure of this synod, especially as Hugh's independent power was traced behind it. At German invitation Pope John XV. required French and German bishops at a synod at Aix-la-Chapelle (992), under the presidency of his legate, Abbot Leo, to investigate the matter anew. But the French bishops remained absent and refused to appear in Rome, and adhered to Gerbert and the right of the Synod of Rheims at the assembly at **Chelles**. But the opinion of Rome and the growing strictly ecclesiastical disposition made Gerbert feel insecure. He entered into negotiations with the Pope, the Empress Adelheid and Archbishop Willigis, and appeared at a synod convoked by the Roman legate at **Mousson**, which Hugh forbade the French bishops to attend. The synod temporarily prohibited Gerbert from undertaking spiritual functions till a future decision. The negotiations were prolonged, till in 996 Gerbert himself went to Rome and attached himself to the young Otto III.

About this time the condition of affairs in Rome was entirely altered. When Otto, full of exuberant imperial ideals came over the Alps, Pope John XV. died, and the ambassadors of the Roman nobility required of him a new pope. Otto appointed his cousin BRUNO (the son of Duke Otto of Carinthia), who went to Rome accompanied by the German arch-chancellor of Worms, and was unanimously received and installed on the 3rd May, 956, this was the **first German Pope**, GREGORY V., who shortly after Otto's brilliant entry, crowned him Emperor. Crescentius, called to judgment and condemned to exile, was pardoned on the intercession of the Pope. The elevation of Gregory V., an austere and cultured man, in the full vigour of youth, was greeted with joy by all who had at heart the reform of the Church and, for its sake, the elevation of the deeply degraded Roman see. The alliance with the Empire also appeared in the character of a saving benefit. A like effort seemed to unite them both. The Empire placed its power at the service of the Church. It is true that under the given circumstances a more serious conception of the dignity and duty of the Church and its head was almost necessarily at the same time a re-

admission of the lofty claims of the papacy to dominion in the Church and in the world. In this manner Gregory V. himself laid hold of his task. Soon after entering upon his pontificate, he designated Gerbert, in spite of his presence and alliance with the Emperor, an intruder in the see of Rheims. From Hugh Capet's son Robert, who in October, 996, had succeeded his father on the throne, his legate demanded the release of Arnulf, which actually ensued. Without taking any measures against Gerbert himself, Gregory cited the French bishops who had assented to Arnulf's deposition to Pavia in the beginning of 997, and when they did not appear, removed them from their offices pending further proceedings. At the same assembly he declared against Robert's second marriage, into which he had entered after repudiating his first wife, and required penance of all bishops who had favoured the marriage. With Robert indeed he did not succeed, but Arnulf was formally installed in his office, and the French Church subjected itself to Rome. But meanwhile Gerbert had concluded peace with Rome in another fashion. The talented and fantastic Otto III. found great satisfaction for his urgent desire for knowledge and "Greek refinement" in intercourse with Gerbert. The learned man, versed in literature and rhetoric, became his adviser. Otto procured for him the archbishopric of Ravenna, and Gerbert now turned altogether into the channel of the curia.

In the meantime, while Gregory lingered at Pavia, Crescentius had again obtained mastery of the city of Rome and raised up an anti-Pope. But Otto now led Gregory back to Rome, where the anti-Pope John, brought in a prisoner and mutilated, was ignominiously insulted at the command of the ruthless Gregory, in spite of the intercession of the revered hermit Nilus; but Crescentius was besieged in the castle of S. Angelo and afterwards executed (April, 998). The Roman Church was assisted in obtaining all its possessions; but Gregory who was still very young, and hated by the Italians on account of his ecclesiastical severity, died suddenly in the very midst of his strenuous activity and great projects, and the friend of the Emperor, Gerbert himself, who had formerly so notably opposed the papacy, now succeeded as SYLVESTER II. (999-1003) and completely entered into the principles of his predecessor. He confirmed his most embittered opponent Arnulf of Rheims, and received him honourably in Rome. King Robert was actually obliged to separate from his wife Bertha. Lofty but also fantastic plans agitated the Empire and papacy, which were closely allied in Otto and Sylvester. Sylvester prosecuted the universal claims of

the papacy, and himself gave expression to the idea of a crusade. Otto gave himself up to a tendency to ecstatic piety which was specially nourished by contact with Adalbert of Prague, Romuald, Nilus and Odilo of Clugny, but at the same time under Gerbert's influence, to high-flying plans, not only for the strengthening of the hitherto Romano-German Empire, but for the establishment of a Roman world-empire, a sort of Christian universal monarchy. Just at that time new and great prospects were opening for the spread of Christianity (*vid.* Poland, Hungary, etc.), which were seized on with equal vigour by both Pope and Emperor, but not in the sense of the practical policy of the German Empire, but rather in the interest of the papal universal monarchy which had a still wider ambition. Thus Otto, without regard to the German Church, could favour the elevation of Gnesen into an independent archbishopric, and the reception of the crown by Hungary from the hand of the Pope.

The much discussed so-called Diploma of Otto III. (MGL. II. B. 162, Watterich, *vita Pontificum*, I. 695), in which Otto makes a gift to the Pope of eight counties in the Romagna, which had long been the subject of controversy between the Empire and the see of Peter, but expressly without any reference whatever to earlier donations, such as the forged donation of Constantine, but out of his free sovereign power, may be regarded as spurious in spite of Pertz's defence.

The artificial edifice of Otto's power now quickly collapsed and the blow struck the papacy along with it. Returning from his last stay in Germany, Otto found southern Italy in revolt; an insurrection in Rome, which threatened the person of the Emperor, was put down with difficulty. Soon thereafter Otto went with Sylvester to Ravenna, and during new preparation for war, and while revolt from the Emperor was being contemplated in Germany, the youthful Otto died in 1002, on the 23rd January. Sylvester made his peace with Rome and returned. But his support was broken, and in the following year he followed his imperial friend in death (1003).

6. From the death of Sylvester II. to the Synod of Sutri.

Sources: in Watterich, I., the Papal letters of the popes in question in Ml. 139, 141, and 142. *Literature*: *Jbb. d. d. R. unter Heinrich II.*, by HIRSCH, completed by PABST and H. Bresslau, 3 vols., 1862-1875; *unter Konrad II.*, by H. BRESSLAU, 2 vols., 1879, 1884; *unter Heinrich III.*, by STEINDORF, 2 vols., 1874, 1881. MÜCKE, *Konrad II. u. Heinr. III.*, Halle 1873. C. WILL, *Die Anfänge der Restauration der Kirche im 11 Jh.* Marburg 1859, 1864. W. Martens in ZKR. vols. 20-22. HÖFLER, *vid. sup.* p. 178.

Since the Fall of Otto, and while the last emperor of the Saxon House, Henry II., Otto's kinsman, had first in the next years to win

the royal supremacy in Germany, ARDUIN of Ivrea arose as king in Upper Italy, against whom Henry, elected by the Lombards in 1004, was only gradually able to prevail. In Rome, John, the son of Crescentius, who fell in 998, exercised rule as Patricius. The next popes, John XVII. and XVIII., and Sergius IV., were his creatures. At the same time he nominally sought to maintain a certain recognition of Henry as liege-lord by presents and the like, but sought as far as possible to evade any real interference of his power. But after his death and that of Sergius, which followed shortly thereafter, the opposition family of the Counts of Tusculum (descendants of Alberic) obtained the preponderance in Rome. THEOPHYLACT, belonging to this family, ascended the papal throne as Benedict VIII., and asserted it against the opposition candidate, Gregory, who had been set up, and who betook himself to Germany to Henry, in order to appeal to his help as arbiter. With force and energy, supported by the power of his family, Benedict first established the external power of the Roman Church over the small Italian dynasties, and humbled the Crescentians, but at the same time took up the idea of ecclesiastical reform proper. The pious German Henry now entered into alliance with Benedict without regard to Gregory. Henry, who in Germany found in the bishops the support of his royal power against the secular nobility, greatly favoured them, but at the same time decidedly maintained his royal rights (of appointing to bishoprics), and while giving much, also required much in the service of the Empire, showed decided zeal not only for the protection of ecclesiastical and monastic property against rapacious violence, but also in other ways for the carrying out of the laws of the Church, and at this point proved favourable to the church-reforming tendencies of BENEDICT. Thus we find him on his advance into Italy, at the assembly of **Ravenna** in the beginning of 1014, in friendly relations with the influential ODILO of Clugny and the like-minded Abbot HUGO of Farva. At Ravenna he championed the property of the Church and the much-oppressed monasteries. In Rome, soon thereafter, HENRY, along with his wife CUNIGUNDE, received the imperial crown from Pope Benedict in return for his vow to be the faithful patron and protector of the Roman Church ;¹ there is no question of a feudal relation of the Pope to the Emperor. Indeed, soon thereafter, Henry was also obliged to leave Benedict himself to get the better of his enemies in Italy (Arabs and Greeks). At one with the Pope in the effort after ecclesiastical reforms, Henry was able to contemplate the

¹ Thietmar, VII. 1.

Pope's efforts after power over the Church so much the more quietly, as a threatening ascendancy was not to be feared from one who was oppressed in his own country. In the erection of the new bishopric of Bamberg, which had been already confirmed by a bull of John XVIII. (Jaffé, 3024), Henry and Benedict went hand in hand; Benedict came himself, was most honourably received in Bamberg, and consecrated the church of S. Stephen there in 1020. On this occasion Henry confirmed to the Pope all his previous possessions, and gave and received new assurances.¹ The important synod at **Pavia**, in 1022,² showed the growth of the ecclesiastical demands for reform, as indicated by Hildebrand. If on the whole the French bishops resisted the reforming tendencies which were so decidedly championed by the French monks (**Clugny**), the German higher clergy showed themselves more accessible to the ideas of ecclesiastical reform and legislation, but at the same time, and exactly in the interest of ecclesiastical order, knew how to guard their independence of Rome. This is shown by the **resolutions of Seligenstadt** under Aribio of Mayence (1022 or 1023), which expressly set aside the Pope's right of hearing appeals. No one is to dare to go to Rome without the permission of his bishop, no one to evade the penance imposed by his priest (in cases of mortal sin) by applying directly to Rome and without episcopal letters. This affair aroused Benedict's wrath, against which Aribio of Mayence sought further to protect himself by the National Council at Höchst (1024). But Benedict died in 1024; in the same year Henry II. also, the "saint" Henry, who had attested his ecclesiastical disposition by many ecclesiastical foundations, and whose marriage with Cunigunde was reputed to be monastic.

Benedict was succeeded, through violence and corruption, by his brother, a layman, under the title of John XIX., "in one day Prefect and Pope." In 1027 he solemnly consecrated at Easter, the (Salic) Frank Conrad II., Emperor in Rome, in presence of the great Cnute, who happened to be on a pilgrimage, and of King Rudolf of Burgundy (which soon thereafter, after his death, was added to the Empire by Conrad). Pope and Emperor then conceded to Cnute that the northern pilgrims should not be burdened with

¹ The charter (in Watterich, I. 704) confirms, with for the most part verbal repetition, the former privileges of Lewis the Pious of 817, and Otto I. of 962, along with the addition of a few new points. Cf. Ficker, *Forschungen zur ital. Reichs- u. Rechtsgesch.*, II. 232 sqq.

² Mansi, XIX. 343 sqq. Cf. MGL., II. 561 sqq. The date, 1022, is to be maintained against Giesebrecht. *Vid.* Bresslau in HIRSCH, *Heinrich II.*, III. 342 sqq.

oppressive taxes. If this Pope had already drawn upon himself the hatred of Rome and the contempt of Christendom, the Roman see sank still deeper under the cousin of the last two popes, THEOPHYLACT, a boy of twelve, for whom his father, Count Alberic of Tusculum, procured the Roman see with money. As Benedict IX. he shamelessly disgraced it by murder, robbery and dissoluteness. He had already to take flight in 1037, but the Emperor Conrad, in the conflict with the Lombard bishops, at whose head stood Aribert of Milan, led the Pope back to Rome and caused him to lay Aribert under the ban. In the year 1044 the Romans elevated Bishop John of S. Sabina, a rich prelate, who spent much money, to the see of Rome as Sylvester III. Benedict, indeed, returned once more by the help of his family, and the Romans allowed Sylvester to fall; he seems to have made his peace with Benedict.¹ But finally Benedict himself sold the papal see for a considerable sum of money to the Archpresbyter Johannes Gratianus (1045), who had the reputation of a pious man. He called himself GREGORY VI., and his elevation was greeted with joy and hope by the ecclesiastical circles of Italy, the monastic party and Peter Damiani. It is conjectured that the monetary transaction at first remained unknown to these circles, *e.g.*, Damiani expected well of him just in regard to simony.

But now, after the death of his father Conrad, in 1039, Henry III. interfered, a ruler who was full of power for both science and art, but who was also warmly affected towards the strengthening and disciplining of the Church. He too had been anointed with holy oil, he declared, and had the duty of ruling his empire with piety, but also in the consciousness of divine consecration, humbling himself before the priests, but also requiring absolute obedience from the ecclesiastical dignitaries of the Empire. At a synod at Constance he once ascended the pulpit with the bishop. At the assembly of the Empire at Aix-la-Chapelle, he compelled Widger, whom he had himself raised to the archbishopric of Ravenna, to lay down his office, because he had neglected for two years to obtain episcopal consecration. He thereby earned the thanks of Damiani, but had to hear the protest of Bishop Wazo of Liège against it as an interference with the rights of the Pope. Ostensibly the bishops had assented, and Widger had only voluntarily given back the staff and ring into the hands of Henry; in truth, however, Henry probably carried through the deposition.² When Henry had now marched across the Alps, and in Milan, after Aribert's death, had appointed a

¹ *Vid.* Steindorff, *Heinrich III.*, I. 158 sqq.

² *Vid.* Anselmi *Gesta episcoporum Leod.*, Cap. 58. MGS. VII. 224.

simple rural cleric to be bishop in despite of all the resisting parties, the synod, held in his presence at Pavia in the autumn of 1046, showed the decided tendency to serious ecclesiastical principles of reform. It was here perhaps, where to the terror of the bishops, he censured the rooted cancer of simony,¹ by which venality every ecclesiastical grade, from the first bishops down to the last door-keeper, was disgraced. On this point (he said) he would care for the soul of his father, who had only too much practised execrable avarice, and he proposed that the ban should be uttered against both the taker and the giver of money for ecclesiastical posts. At the synod arranged by Henry in December, 1046, at Sutri, in the neighbourhood of Rome, not only was the deposition of the already retired Sylvester III. confirmed, but Gregory VI. also, who had already come to an agreement with Henry at Piacenza, was deposed as a Simonist.² Finally, probably in Rome, Benedict IX. himself was declared to have forfeited the papal dignity.³ Henry now elevated the German SUIDGER of Bamberg, as Clement II. Certainly the form of an election seems to have been retained, but the decision naturally lay with the Emperor. Clement performed the imperial coronation of Henry and his wife, on which occasion the Romans induced him to declare himself their Patricius, and conceded him the principate in the election of the popes, *i.e.*, the nomination of the Pope to be elected. This was essentially an approximation to what Otto I. in 963 had desired and attained. But the expression *Patricius* has now its own significance with reference to the patriciate exercised by the Italian noble families, by which they practically held in their hands the appointment to the Papal see.⁴ In the beginning of 1047 Clement held a further great synod in Rome, at which steps were taken against simony, and, it is to be conjectured, the decree was issued, according to which a cleric who had been consecrated by a *simoniacus*, who had been conscious of the fact at his consecration, was obliged to undertake forty days' penance, but was then to remain in his post. Clement, whose mild personal procedure little corresponded with

¹ *Vid.* on this point Glaber Rud., V. 5, *De exstirpatione simoniaca*. MGS., VII. 71, and in addition Steindorff, *Heinrich III.*, I. 497 sqq.

² Out of this Bonito, in the *Liber ad amicum*, made an alleged self-deposition by Gregory. Gregory was afterwards obliged with his chaplain Hildebrand to follow the Emperor to Germany, where he remained in the diocese of Cologne till his death.

³ *Vid.* Petrus Damiani, Opp. III. 220. *Depositus est, qui suscepit* (scit. Gregorius), *non excommunicatus est, qui deseruit* (Benedict IX.).

⁴ On the meaning of the Patriciate, *vid.* Steindorff, I. 506 sqq.

the expectations of the zealous Damiani, died as early as October, 1047, and was interred in his beloved Bamberg. Once more Benedict returned for a short time, but had to give place to Bishop Poppo of Brixen (Damasus II.), who was appointed by the Emperor. After Clement's death, the Romans had at once applied to Henry for the appointment of a new head of the Church.

CHAPTER THIRD.

Monasticism.

Sources: Vita BENEDICTI ANIAN. in MABILLON, *A.S. Bened.* 4 sæc. Vol. I. *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis, in qua s. Patrum Abbatum Cluniac. vitæ et c. curis M. Marrier et Andr. Quercetani.* Par. 1614. (Therein also the *Consuetudines Cluniacenses*). Vita JOHANNIS GORZIENSIS in MGS. IV. 337. Vita S. DUNSTAN. ASB. 19 May. The Vita ROMUALDI by DAMIANI, Opp. II. 188 (MI. 144, 953). Vita GUALBERTI in Mab. AS., II. 237. *Literature*: *Vid.* i. 22, No. 6. cf. i. 355.

THE **monasteries**, endowed with the possession of immunities, as important members of the organism of politico-social life necessarily give themselves up to purely secular interests; on the other hand as the representatives of the moral ideal peculiar to the Church, they are adapted in certain circumstances to become important foci for increasing Christian ecclesiastical tendencies. The arrangements as to monasteries and abbeys made by the Carolingians, clearly suggested by the necessities of political life, especially of providing for deserving magnates, very frequently alienated the monasteries from their proper object; lay-abbots, *abbato-comites* (*vid. sup.* p. 109) came to preside over them. The complaints of the bishops on this point and the demand for restitution at the assembly of the three Frankish kings at **Diedenhofen** in 844 received the response: where the transference of the monasteries from lay-abbots to spiritual (monastic) leaders was impracticable on account of necessities of state, the bishops were at least to take care that the monasteries should not suffer distress and that the monks should not be withdrawn from the rule of the monastic life. But in the course of the ninth and tenth centuries such bestowals of the monasteries as benefices upon non-monks still further increased. They were even given as dowries to princesses. Bishops also allowed themselves to be endowed with them.¹

This tendency was now opposed from time to time, by an effort to retain and restore the monasteries for their original purposes, and at the same time to make them foci of ecclesiastical life. BENEDICT

¹ All considerable monasteries remained in lay hands or passed from one lay hand to another, till far on in the tenth century.

of Aniane had already wrought towards this end under Charles and then under Lewis the Pious. Witiza, born about 750, of noble descent, had lived as a youth at the courts of Pippin and Charlemagne (in 774 had shared in Charlemagne's campaign against the Lombards), but had suddenly renounced the world, subsequently even assumed the name of the celebrated monastic saint, and founded a monastery (Aniane in the Cevennes), which, soon favoured by Charlemagne, flourished greatly, being exempted by him from the jurisdiction of any bishop or count. Benedict continued the effort to make the monastery an educational institution. He was employed by Charles in various ecclesiastical affairs (*vid.* Adoptionism). Lewis the Pious commissioned him with the supervision of all the monasteries of Aquitaine, in which he sought to set up the Benedictine rule and to establish the decayed discipline—the first example of a wider association. As to Lewis's conduct to Benedict *vid.* Ermoldus Nigellus, *De gestis Ludov. P.* II. from 481–602.

Nevertheless among the monasteries a considerable number, in the Carolingian age, remained of prominent authority and in part were of great importance for ecclesiastical culture. Such were **Corbie**, a seat of Frankish scholarship, and its branch establishment **Corvey** from which Ansgar proceeded, **Fulda**, **St. Gall**, **Reichenau** (under Walafried Strabo) and others. But the political disorders of the second half of the ninth century checked their higher efforts, and, along with the bestowal of the monasteries on lay-abbots, even led to the entire dissolution of the monastic life. (Marriage of monks, division of property, endowment of children with monastic property.)

In the monastery of **Clugny** (Cluny, Cluniacum) in Burgundy, founded by Duke WILLIAM of Aquitaine and immediately subordinated to the Roman Church and **to it alone**, Abbot BERNO (a man of a family of counts, previously abbot of the monastery of Beaume near Dijon), whom he appointed, in 910 restored the Rule of Benedict, and his successor Odo (927–41), under whom donations flowed into the monastery from all sides, carried the reforms further and was made use of, as Berno had also been, to carry out reforms in other monasteries also. The Benedictine rule was augmented by him and his successors by peculiar additions, which were subsequently collected as the "*Consuetudines Cluniacenses*."¹ In this way there was here formed the first **Congregation** proper of the Benedictine order. From an early period onwards in this Con-

¹ By Bernard of Cl., then also by Ulrich of Cl., to serve as model to the efforts of Abbot William of Hirschau (*vid. inf.*).

gregation, energetic efforts after the establishment of a zealous monastic life in asceticism and the exercise of devotion¹ are combined with the aim of **general ecclesiastical reform in the hierarchical sense**, which made the order under MAJOLUS (—994), and especially Odilo (—1048), a most highly influential factor in the great politico-ecclesiastical life of the time. The monastic spirit here stands in the closest alliance with the energetic prosecution of ecclesiastical aims and therefore with great **worldly wisdom**.² The Cluniacs were absolutely the most decided workers for that exaltation of the papacy and the supreme power of the Church which took place in the days of Hildebrand. It was also promoted by the closer knitting together of the Congregation, all the monasteries of which were subject to the Abbot of Cluny, and hence, from that time onwards are mostly no longer headed by **Abbots**, but only by **Priors** (with few exceptions, in which the name of abbot is retained.) The Abbot of Cluny, as *archiabbas*, appoints the priors, and in general exercises a power with very few limits. About the same time in **England** there occur the energetic efforts and conflicts over the reform of monasteries and the clergy by S. DUNSTAN, abbot in Glastonbury, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury (954-989), the rough but powerful ecclesiastic, who also desired to reform the clergy in accordance with monastic standards.

Of another character was originally the fanatically exaggerated tendency, which asserted itself in Italy about the close of the tenth century, towards over-driven asceticism and devotional exercises, merits gained by prayer, and therefore towards **anchoritism**, such as appeared as the highest piety at the court of Otto III., in the most abrupt contrast to the dissoluteness of the time, and which we have also encountered in ADALBERT of Prague. Romuald, born at Ravenna, of a family of rank, is the most eminent representative of this tendency. Everywhere, where he settled in solitude, great hosts immediately gathered about him, whom he grouped in associations of hermits, and himself again sought solitude elsewhere. We also find here the impulse towards sending out missionaries; he himself however was compelled by sickness to abstain from a missionary attempt on Hungary. Among his anchorite foundations (which were thereafter left by him to themselves, and so in the nature of the case easily ran wild), there was also

¹ The silence in church and dormitory, at table and in the kitchen, is peculiar, *vid.* Gieseler, II. 1, 298.

² Cf. how monastic sentiments and hierarchical tendency interpenetrate one another in DAMIANI.

the at first very small association of hermits on the **Campus Maldoli**, a lofty place, very difficult of access, in the Apennines, near Arezzo (1018). This **Camaldoli**, in which the strict spirit of the hermit life was maintained, became subsequently, when PETER DAMIANI, himself a monk of a monastery of this character, had set up the life of S. ROMUALD as the ideal, the centre and head of the widespread **hermit order** of the **Camaldolites**, which had branched off from the Benedictine order, not as a reformed congregation, but as a class of the perfect, which had grown out of it. Ecclesiastico-political activity was not involved in the original character of this eremitic system, which was directed towards special holiness and freedom from needs. But DAMIANI shows how the spirit of the age made this form of monasticism also serviceable to the ideals of the Church. Individual personages, such as Saint NILUS¹ of Calabria (910-1005), developed, on the basis of similar ascetic disposition, a great personal influence by means of the deepening and intensifying of religious moral conceptions.

From the ardent and ecstatic tendency of the time there proceeded also the order of **Vallombrosa** in the Apennines, not far from Florence (1038), founded by JOHANNES GUALBERT, Lord of Pistoja, which however is an order of **cœnobites** not hermits. These reforming efforts penetrated last to Germany. Here, indeed, *e.g.* Archbishop BRUN of Cologne worked in this sense, especially in Lotharingia, where the monastery of **Gorze** near Metz distinguished itself in this direction under Abbot John; but the monastic population, even of esteemed monasteries, as *e.g.* St. Gall and Reichenau, were little inclined to allow themselves to be disturbed in their comfortable life by stricter ecclesiastical discipline, and resisted it to the utmost in the beginning of the tenth century. To the ingenuous monk Widukind in Corvey the strict regulations appeared as *gravis persecutio* of the poor monks. It was only with the beginning of the following period that the example of Cluny and of France in general worked more generally in Germany. In this period it still remained the rule that the monasteries stood under the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishops to whose dioceses they belonged; numerous papal privileges seek only to secure them against episcopal interference with their administration and to preserve to them free disposal of the monastic property, or to maintain the free election of the abbots, which latter was indeed frequently enough illusory, on account of the encroachment of the secular power, the bestowal of monasteries on laymen, and also the deposition and imposition of persons as

¹ *Vid.* NEANDER, *Denkw. aus d. g. des christl. Lebens*, 3rd ed. II. 220-235.

abbots in the so-called **royal monasteries**. The abbot may teach and preach; the requisite ordinations of clergy and ecclesiastical acts of consecration, which the bishop only can perform, the latter is to carry out for the monastery without remuneration. On the other hand the episcopal duty (and accordingly right) of visiting the monasteries is repeatedly inculcated, and the canonical obedience of the abbots is required.—When the monastery of Clugny under Odilo, appealing to its charter of foundation, laid claim to the right of exemption from its diocesan bishop (and therewith to the right of obtaining ordination and consecration from any bishop it chose), the Synod of Anse in 1025, appealing to the ancient canonical regulations, declared against it, and in favour of the regular power of the diocesan bishop. But a new controversy of the Bishop of Maçon with the Abbot of Clugny, in which Damiani took the side of the latter (Synod of Châlons, 1063), gave Pope Alexander II. an opportunity of really exempting Clugny. No bishop was to enter it without the invitation of the abbot; the abbot may apply to any bishop he likes for the requisite acts, and no bishop is to have the power of excommunicating the monasteries. It was the league of the papacy with this ecclesiastically reforming monasticism against the bishops. Clugny's example was soon followed by many, especially by Cluniac monasteries.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

Christian Culture and Science.

1. The Ninth Century.

Literature: Histoire littéraire de la France, vols. IV. and V. EBERT, *Allg. Gesch. der Literatur des MA. im Abendlande*, vol. II., Lpz. 1880 and 1887.

THE germs sown and impulses given from the time of Charlemagne, grow and extend their influence at first, but the general efforts for the propagation and spread of Christian scientific culture already recede under LEWIS the Pious, as is shown by repeated good resolutions (Synod of Attigny, 822; Aix-la-Chapelle, 825). The maintenance of the episcopal cathedral schools is inculcated (Paris, 829, can. 30), and the Emperor is petitioned for the erection of several higher schools (imperial, at three places in the Empire). The complaints as to the decay of scientific education subsequently increase. Cathedral and monastic schools (Tours, Orleans, Lyons, Rheims, Corbie and its branch foundation Neucorvey on the Weser, Fulda, Reichenau, and St. Gall) are the centres. The influences of the school at Tours (Alcuin) may be traced everywhere in its scholars. Under Hrabanus Maurus, who likewise proceeded from Tours, Fulda is the centre for Germany and farther, whence culture spreads on various sides.

HRABAN, who, probably as a native of Mayence (Ebert), called himself MAGNENTIUS and received from Alcuin the surname of Maurus, after the favourite disciple of S. Benedict, received his education as a boy in Fulda, was sent in 800 as a deacon to Alcuin at Tours (*liberales discendi gratia artes*), and after his return became the teacher of the monastic school of Fulda, which rose under him, especially after the entrance upon office of Abbot EIGIL (817), whose successor Hraban became in 822. As abbot also, he was active in instruction and study, so far as the business of administering the large and rich monastery permitted, and being little inclined towards participation in the great political movement, he laid aside his dignity as abbot in 842 and devoted himself to literary occupations on the Petersberg near Fulda, till on the death of Archbishop Otgar he ascended the archiepiscopal throne of Mayence. He died in 856.

Hraban maintains the Carolingian efforts after culture in the sense of his master Alcuin, writes compendia for instruction in the liberal arts (grammar, prosody, on the alphabets of different languages—including runes—and on chronology; *De computo*) and for the further education of the clergy: *De clericorum institutione*, a compilation which treats of the Church, the sacraments, canonical hours, feasts, lessons, the confession of faith, etc., as well as of the compass of clerical culture, in which the "Science of the heathen," the seven liberal arts, and also philosophy are duly recognised. The twenty-two books *De universo*, while making great use of the etymologies of Isidore of Seville, give an encyclopedia of knowledge in accordance with the horizon of the time, but with allusion to the mystical significance of things.

His **Biblical Commentaries** are industrious compilations from Latin fathers, and were meant to replace the old exegetes; he ventures however to intersperse explanations of his own. The allegorical explanation strongly superabounds, especially in the O.T. His other writings were partly called forth by ecclesiastical controversies (on the rural bishops; on predestination, against Gottschalk; on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper of Paschasius Radbertus), partly theological considerations on practical questions of the moral life of the Church (on forbidden degrees in marriage; as to what is to be held regarding magic arts; of the reverence of children towards their parents, on occasion of the conflict between Lewis the Pious and his sons).

Of his sermons, the one collection, dedicated to Archbishop Heistulf, has the thoroughly practical object of treating of everything which is necessary to the people in a moral and enlightening way.

He also practised the **Latin versification** which was so greatly favoured and fostered in Alcuin's circle. In short, the efforts after culture of the Carolingian circle, with their spiritual-practical aims, survive here in a noble fashion. Opp. Ml. 107–112. *Vid.* GEGENBAUR, *Die Klosterschule zu Fulda*, 1856. The monograph by Kunstmann, 1841. F. KÄHLER in *ZhTh.* 1874. The learned Bishop HAIMO of Halberstadt (840–853) also proceeded from the school of Alcuin and Hraban; he was the author of commentaries, a *Homiliarium* and a Church-history, drawing from Rufinus and Cassiodorus, Ml. 116–118 (*Vid.* i. p. 8).

In the monastery of **Reichenau**, WALAFRIED STRABO (the squint-eyed) received his first education as a boy under Abbot Haito; his teachers were ERLENBALD, the monk WETTIN, and others. After visiting Fulda again from 847, and then becoming tutor to the future king Charles the Bald, he received from Lewis the Pious in 838 the abbey of Reichenau. Lewis the German drove him away for some years from this seat which he had made famous; he died in 849. Distinguished as a **skilled Latin poet** (poetical version of the remarkable *Visio Wettini*; *Hortulus*, a didactic description of the growth of his establishment; Lives of Saints (St. Gallus), Epistles, Epigrams. His treatise: **De exordiis et incrementis rerum ecclesiasticarum** elucidates matters pertaining to the ecclesiastical cultus (church bells, images, the mass, hymns, etc.). His name was mostly made famous in subsequent times by the great compilation, the **Glossa ordinaria**, which, for a long time the most treasured quarry for exegesis for the Middle Ages, in attachment to Hraban's commentary, drew from the older exegetes, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory the Great, Isidore, Bede, and others. The Latin text of the Bible is surrounded with these exegetical excerpts (with indication of the authors); "it was less the object of his effort to gain the fame of giving what was new, than to gain the reputation of correctly utilizing the famous ancients" (Reuss). In many editions the **Glossa linearis** of ANSHELM of Laon, which only belongs to the twelfth century, is included.

Not less than here and in **St. Gall**, and even in a still higher degree, literary studies are pursued in **Lotharingia**, where the monastery of **Prüm** (**WANDELBERT**) and the bishopric of **Liège** distinguish themselves. Here the Irish **SEDULIUS SCOTUS**, a fertile Latin poet, found reception with the bishop. In the West-Frankish kingdom, **Tours** and the monastery of **Ferrières** (once in the possession of **Alcuin**) were eminent seats of study. Alongside of the humanistic efforts which are fostered here also, great activity is also exhibited in the theological sphere, favoured by **Charles the Bald**.

Among the **theologians who are still immediately rooted in the Carolingian age** the following are prominent:—

AGOBARD of Lyons, trained under Bishop **LEIDRAD**, to whom the church and school of his diocese owed much, and whose successor he became in 816, was removed from his bishopric for a long time through his lively partizanship in the political conflicts of his time (*vid. sup.*), but was reinstated before his death (840). Penetrated by those tendencies towards culture of the Carolingian age, he **combats the superstitions and prejudices of his time**, e.g. the superstition of the sorcerers, **in the interest of Christian civilization**, sharply opposes the worship of images, which, because faith has died out of the heart, sets all its trust upon visible things. So likewise he opposed ordeals. These and other of his writings (such as the *Liber apologeticus pro filiis Ludovici*, dictated by strong political passion) bear the character of **fugitive pieces**, which are directly concerned with the questions of the time. With striking severity he declares himself in several writings against the Jews, who in Southern France were treated with much tolerance by the people and were favoured by **Lewis the Pious** and other magnates (*De insolentia Judæorum*; occasioned by the baptism of heathen slaves in the possession of Israelites). Against Abbot **FREDEGIS** of Tours, **Alcuin's** successor, and his strict doctrine of inspiration, he vindicated his own more liberal doctrine; he interfered in the discussions on Adoptionism, and he also carried on dogmatical and liturgical feuds with **AMALARIUS** (presbyter of Metz, afterwards Abbot of Hornbach, † 827), who, moreover, presided over the Church of Lyons during **Agobard's** exile. (Opp. ed. St. Baluze, 2 T., Paris 1666. Ml. 104. Dissert. by Hundeshagen, 1831. Blügel, 1865, and especially **LEIST**, *Gymnas. Prog.* v. Stendal, 1867. H. Reuter, *G. d. Aufkl.*, I. 24 sqq.)

CLAUDIUS, born in Spain, a disciple of **Felix of Urgel**, teacher at the Court School of **King Lewis** in Aquitaine, was in 820 (perhaps even sooner), made Bishop of Turin by **Lewis**, in order that he might bring the pure gospel to the people there who were stuck fast in superstition. Behind **Agobard** in humanist culture, but surpassing him in theological importance, and standing under the strong and decisive influence of **AUGUSTINE**, he sees what is decisive for salvation in exaltation to the purely spiritual and supra-mundane being of God and exclusive dependence on Him, and starting from this idea of religion, combated in radical fashion the entire sensuous tendency of the cultus, relics, pilgrimages, images, but also the mediation of salvation by the saints, and therefore the worship of the saints. **Claudius** excited great offence by his practical proceedings; he justified himself in the *Apologeticum atque rescriptum adv. Theutmirum abbatem* (only known to us fragmentarily from the counter-treatises of the learned Scot **DUNGAL**, *Responsa contra perversas Claudii sententias*, Ml.

105 and of Bishop JONAS of Orleans). Of his numerous **Biblical commentaries** fragments only have come down. Opusc. in Ml. 104, Rudelbach, *ined. opp. specimina præmissa de eius doct. scriptisque dissertatione*, Kopenh. 1824. C. Schmidt in ZhTh. 1843.

At the instigation of the Emperor Lewis the Pious the radical reforming tendencies of Claudius were opposed by Bishop JONAS of Orleans (843), a man who was rooted in the Carolingian culture both on the side of humanism and on that of theology, the successor of Theodulf of Orleans, of important weight in the synodal discussions of the time. A representative of the Carolingian view of images, he had so much the more cause to oppose the far-reaching ideas of Claudius. His *De cultu imaginum*, at first interrupted by the death of Claudius, was subsequently completed and dedicated to Charles the Bald, and was intended to guard the position of the Gallican and German clergy against the reproach of idolatry made by the Italian bishop. His treatise *De institutione regia*, for King Pippin of Aquitaine, comprises (834) a collection from the Acts of the Paris Synod of 829, which were important for the efforts after culture of the age, and in which Jonas took a most vigorous part.—The treatise *De institutione laicali*, composed to meet the enquiry of Matfried, a layman, "how he and the others who were bound by the bond of matrimony were to regulate a life pleasing to God," is for the most part composed of passages from Scripture and the fathers and likewise stands in close relation to the Acts of the Synod of Paris of 829 (*vid.* Ebert, II. 228). Ml. 106. On the three last-mentioned persons: FÖRSTER, *Drei Erzbischöfe vor 1000 Jahren*, Gütersloh 1874.

Among the younger generation, especially in the **West-Frankish domain**, the fruits of the Carolingian endeavours emerge in a series of important theologians, who partly also continue to share in the lively humanist interests of the Carolingian age.

SERVATUS LUPUS, born about 805, was trained in the monastery of Ferrières under Abbot Aldrich, afterwards with Hraban in Fulda, where he stood on intimate relations with EINHARD and shared his classical interests; having returned, he enjoyed the favour of Lewis the Pious and the Empress Judith, subsequently became Abbot of Ferrières and as such was in lively intercourse with important church-men, participating in ecclesiastical and ecclesiastico-political affairs, and was concerned along with them in the disturbances and miseries of the age. His **letters** (130) exhibit the man who amid all the civil and ecclesiastical controversies adheres to his loving exertions for classical studies and receives culture from them; his *Vita S. Wigberti* is distinguished above all this class of literature by historical simplicity; theologically, in the Gottschalk controversy, he champions the ideas of Augustine in a decided but moderate fashion and an urbane manner. Opp. ed. Baluze, Paris 1664, and Antw. 1710. Ml. 119. SPROTT, *Serv. L.*, Regensburg 1880.

RADBERTUS PASCHASIUS, born at Soissons about 790, received his first education in a nunnery, then took up the secular career, but in 812 entered the monastery of **Corbie** under Abbot Adalhard, where he gained his extensive classical and theological culture and afterwards turned it to account as teacher of the monastery; on terms of close friendship with Adalhard and his brother and successor Wala, whose panegyric biographies he supplied, he accompanied the brothers to Saxony, in 882, for the purpose of founding New Corvey, on the Weser. Himself abbot from 844, he retired entirely into his studies in 851, lived for a long time at S. Riquier, and died at Corbie in 865. As a teacher he

exercised an important influence, and not less by his writings. Among his exegetical writings the *Expositio in Matth.*, in 12 books, which originated in his running lectures on Matthew, in the monastery, is distinguished by comparative adherence to the bare sense of the words. His book *De fide, spe et charitate*, intended for instruction, rests throughout on Augustinian conceptions, which are also to be recognised in his famous book *De corpore et sangu. Chr.* (*vid. inf.*), intermixed, of course, with others belonging to the specifically mediæval manner of thought. Opp. ed. Sirmond, Paris 1618. Ml. 120.

A contemporary and monastic companion of his, is a man of many-sided culture who makes an important figure in the dogmatic discussions of the time, the monk RATRAMNUS (*vid. inf.*), in whom the critical activity which hung together with the classical studies of the Carolingian age is also evidenced, which we also perceive elsewhere, *e.g.* in FLORUS and PRUDENTIUS. (Information on this literary criticism in Weizsäcker in *ZhTh.* 1858, p. 334 sqq.) He died after 868. He was a clear-sighted man and energetic thinker, who decidedly took the side of the Augustinian dogma which was persecuted in Gottschalk, and in the controversy with the Greeks, at the instigation of Hincmar, gave his highly valued opinion, in which, in opposition to the Greek dogmatising of even ritual customs, he laid claim to freedom for local differences on these matters; Opp. Ml. 121.

HINCMAR, a man of eminently ecclesiastical character, whose extensive theological studies were directed in the interest of practical questions of ecclesiastical law and politics, was born about 806, educated in the monastery of S. Denis under Abbot Hilduin (archiepiscopal arch-chancellor of Lewis the Pious), with whom he came to the court, was active in ecclesiastical reform, and from 845 was raised to the archbishopric of Rheims († 882). His comprehensive literary activity in letters, memorials, and synodal missives, is closely connected with the movements of ecclesiastical life. For his dogmatic chief work against Gottschalk *vid. inf.* Standing at the centre of the high politics of his time, he wrote the history of his time in the continuation of the *Annales Bertiniani* (after the death of Prudentius) with a broad view and independent mind. He died in the flight before the Normans. Opp. ed. J. Sirmond, 2 vols. Paris 1645. Ml. 125 and 126. NOORDEN, *Hinkmar*, Bonn 1863; SCHÖRRS, *Hinkmar, s. Leben und seine Schriften*, Freiburg 1884.

PRUDENTIUS (Galindo) was a Spaniard by birth, trained in the Court School of Lewis the Pious, from about the middle of the fifth decade Bishop of Troyes (Trecas in the archbishopric of Sens), † 861; he was the continuator of the so-called Bertinian Annals, and distinguished himself as a theologian in the Gottschalkian controversy.

FLORUS DIACONUS (or Magister) belongs to the Church of Lyons, and stood there in alliance with Agobard; he was a skilful poet (*Querela de divisione imperii post mortem Ludovici prii*), penetrated by the political conception of unity which was specially powerful among the clergy, and bemoaning the vanished glory of the time of Charlemagne. He was esteemed as a scholar and theologian, and took part in the dogmatic conflicts of his age (Lord's Supper and Predest.). His Commentary on the Pauline Epistles is entirely compiled from Augustine. His treatise *De actione missæ* shows the interest of the age in questions of the cultus, in which, moreover, he passionately defends his teacher Agobard against Amalarius. His *Martyrologium* is a revision of that of Bede, and on the other hand was again made use of and enriched by Hraban.

The monk CHRISTIAN, at Stavelot (Stablo) in the diocese of Liège (second half of the ninth century), who in consequence of an erroneous statement of Trithe-

nius is wrongly quoted as CHRISTIAN DRUTHMAR, wrote a commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew (Mt. 106), which on principle puts forward the historical sense as the necessary foundation even for the spiritual explanation. *Vid.* E. DÜMMER and SBrAW. XXXVII. (1890), 935 sqq.

In all those mentioned, alongside of general scientific efforts of a humanistic character, such as were fostered by the Carolingian age, we find a theology, which, both in exegesis and dogmatics merely draws on the traditions especially of the Latin fathers, Jerome, Augustine and Gregory the Great, after the model of Alcuin. Even where, as is frequently the case, the delight in dialectical discussions is active, we find, however, purely formal endeavours after the inheritance of the fathers, which is substantially fixed on all essentials.

On the other hand one figure now appears, which rises in entire independence, and not only appropriates the patristic tradition to a much wider extent (through the interweaving of Greek theology and philosophy), but has also received the impulse to a flight of entirely free speculation on the belief of the Church: JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA.

By his contemporaries and the oldest MSS. he is called J. SCOTUS or Scotigena, in the oldest codices of his translation of the Pseudo-Dionysius, Joh. Jerugena (derived from *ιερού* sc. *νήσου*), which subsequently was transformed into ERIGENA, probably in allusion to Erin (Ireland). He therefore came from Ireland (from which indeed the Scots first migrated into Scotland), and both names have the same meaning. Like many of his learned countrymen, in whom the pursuit of higher culture had been awakened and fostered in their native land, and who now sought activity and recognition in the Frankish empire,¹ he had probably come in the beginning of the fifth decade to West Francia and met with a friendly reception from Charles the Bald, the patron of scholars. As teacher and president of the Court School he stood close to the person of the king, who (according to later legends, William of Malmesbury) stood on very confidential friendly relations with him. Equipped with a knowledge of the Greek language, on the commission of Charles the Bald he translated the Pseudo-Dionysian writings, which Lewis the Pious had received from the Greek Emperor Michael Balbus, and which up to that time were as good as unknown in the West (only Gregory the Great shows knowledge of them). His careful verbal translation first led this stream of Neo-Platonic mystical speculation into the West; but J. Scotus also attached himself lovingly to the Greek church-fathers in general who were under Platonic influence, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Maximus Confessor, the expositor of the Dionysian writings. In his book *Περὶ φύσεως μερισμοῦ*, *id est de divisione naturæ*, he develops a philosophic speculation on God and the world based on the internal necessity of reason, which in his opinion coincides with the true content of ecclesiastical faith, as the true philosophy is the true religion and conversely, and the two sources of all truth *ratio* and *auctoritas* (divine revelation in Scripture and the church-

¹ *Vid.* the words of Heiric to Charles the Bald in Ebert, II. 118.

fathers) cannot contradict one another, for God reveals Himself progressively in the historical development of religion, and so gives in dogma by the authority of the Church, that which is again recognised and confirmed in its inner necessity by the *ratio*. Thus it may be said that religion is philosophy wrapped up in the form of tradition, and philosophy is religion stripped by reason of the authoritative belief which rests on historical revelation.

The conceptual elements with which he works, especially the conception of the absolute, as purely indeterminate being, lying beyond all determination and opposition, are the Neo-Platonic, as they met him in the Pseudo-Dionysian writings, here grasped on their mystical side, and in the commentator on them, Maximus Confessor, but they are speculatively developed by him in a new and powerful manner. All positive utterances on the divine nature (*θεολογία καταφατική*), as positive, are limiting, not indeed arbitrarily, but are only of unreal, symbolic significance; only the negative, restrictive (*θεολογία ἀποφατική*) have real significance. They lead to a purely transcendent absolute which lies beyond all oppositions, including that of good and evil, and which is unattainable to conception and only reveals itself to contemplation, as the absolute fullness. The world cannot stand over against pure Being, as a second existence; creation is also an improper expression; to say that God creates all things is only to say that He is the true being in all beings; even of love we can only improperly speak, since God is more than love, and produces Himself in everything, or rather is all in all. The universe is only the unfolding and return of the absolute upon itself. God as pure *causa sui*, the potency of all existence, is *natura creans nec creata*; God as the ideal result of Himself, and so at the same time as the principle of all individual being, is *natura creata et creans*, the *verbum dei* as the compendium of the primordial causes of the world. The world as finite things, as the unfolded form of appearance of the divine being, is *natura creata nec creans*; and the absolute as the end of all things is *natura neque creans neque creata*. The world becomes the form of appearance of the absolute, in which the latter, which in itself is pure being = nothing and therefore unconceivable to itself, becomes conceivable; God was not, before the universe was, because He, in Himself pure causality, is only realized in actual being, and hence *deus omnium factor et in omnibus factus*.

Hence there is a divine necessity in everything that exists, a process of God's becoming the creature. For God (the absolute standpoint) there is therefore no evil. He does not know it, for His knowledge and thought is identical with His being, and that with His creation. *Cognoscendo facit, et cognoscit faciendo*. If God knew evil, then it would be necessarily in the nature of things. But it is rather the non-being, which is present for the finite view of the individual. In the whole it ceases to be evil, inasmuch as here it only appears as the necessary contrast, the foil of the good and thus itself good. Connected with this conditioned being is the fact, that it finally disappears in the restoration of all things. Meantime, according to the premises, the whole temporal (successive) conception in general stands on the point of being swallowed up by its consideration as absolute.

Against the whole pantheistic foundation of the system there is, however, in Erigena a certain practical ecclesiastical reaction, which does not allow of its being completely carried out, especially in relation to the human personality and person of Christ.

His contemporaries lacked intelligence for his system as a whole, even for those of its consequences which were dangerous to the faith of the Church; Erigena stood alone and as a prophet of future speculation in his time. Only

when he was drawn into particular questions of controversy, such as that about predestination (*vid. inf.*), did he arouse vigorous objection. Pope Nicholas I., probably in connection with the attacks of Prudentius (in the Synod of Langres) upon him, entertained suspicion of the orthodoxy of the otherwise learned man, and required of Charles the Bald that Scotus' translation of the Dionysian writings should first be laid before him for examination.¹ But Charles the Bald kept him undisturbed in his position till his death in 877. The end of Scotus is doubtful. Frankish and other sources of the time are silent. Later English sources recount his invitation by Alfred the Great to Oxford and his elevation to the office of Abbot of Malmesbury, his murder by his disciples and his canonization which followed; these are narratives the trustworthiness of which was already decidedly attacked by Mabillon and the *Hist. lit. de la France*, and is given up by most moderns, but the kernel of which Staudenmayer, Christlieb and others, finally Hermens (*Leben des J. Sc. Erigena*, Jena 1868) still seek to maintain. (Opp. chief edition by Floss in *ML.* 122. In addition Hauréan, *Commentaire de J. Sc. Erigena sur Martian. Cap.* 1861. Of the numerous monographs special attention is to be called to STAUDENMAYER 1833, CHRISTLIEB 1860, and HUBER 1861.

Alongside of the literary and theological activity of the Frankish Empire in time of Charles the Bald, **Anglo-Saxon** culture is also worthy of regard till towards the end of the ninth century. King ALFRED (871-901), the great fighter against the Danish oppressors, and organizer of his people, also exerted himself zealously in the elevation of scientific culture and himself translated into Anglo-Saxon and revised writings of Orosius, Boethius and Gregory the Great. The translation of Bede's *Hist. eccl. Angl.* is also ascribed to him. His translation of Gregory's *Lib. pastor. curæ* edited by SIEVERS in the Early English Text Society, 1872. Reinh. PAULI, *König Aelfred*, 1851, and J. B. WEISS, *Æ. d. Gr.*, 1852.

The connection of the **Roman Church** with **Greek** scholarship is shown by ANASTASIUS BIBLIOTHECARIUS, the Roman abbot and librarian under Nicholas I. and his two successors (*vid. i. 8, and ii. 3*).

2. The characteristic doctrinal controversies of the time of Charles the Bald.

Literature: vid. the Histories of Dogma, specially J. BACH, Dogm. G. des MA. I. Wien 1873, and A. HARNACK, *Lehrb. d. Dg.*, III. 214-293.

For the state of dogmatic knowledge and dogmatic work, as well as for the relation to patristic theology on the one hand, and for the ecclesiastical views and sentiments of the beginning of the Middle Ages, the following are specially worthy of note.

1. The Eucharistic Controversy which is attached to the name of Paschasius Radbertus.

Sources: RADBERTI l. de corp. et sang. dom. *ML.* 120, 1267. RATRAMNUS, *De c. et s. dom. ad Carol.* *ML.* 121, 125.

He represents the growing tendency of the piety of the age, to

¹ Fragment of a letter in Ivo of Chartres, Jaffé, 2834. On another view in Balæus, *Hist. Univers. Par.*, *vid. Staudenmayer*, p. 166.

make certain of the reality of divine things in the most tangible possible mystery, the magical interference of the Deity in the sensuous world. Already in the Adoptionist controversy, in opposition to the Adoptionist separation of the divine and the human, the desire was felt of adhering to the concrete religious notion of God born of the Virgin as the absolute mystery; and connected therewith are the discussions of Beatus on the sacramental eating of the divine body.¹

In 831, at the the desire of Abbot Warin of Neu-Corvey, Radbertus Paschasius wrote the treatise on the Body and Blood of Christ, which subsequently, as Abbot of Corbie, and so after 844, he sent to Charles the Bald at his desire. The assertions herein set up of a transformation of the elements of the Supper into the body and blood of Christ (*transfere*, not yet *transsubstantiare*) are so much the more striking, the more difficult they are to blend in a unity of conception with the **Augustinian views** on the sacrament, which are maintained by Radbertus and to which he grants a corresponding influence. But basing upon the limitless divine omnipotence and the truth of the word of Christ, he asserts, that, in the consecration by the word of Christ in the Holy Spirit, the elements are transformed into the body and blood of Christ, and indeed what is most wonderful and inconceivable to belief, into **the same body** which was created by the Holy Spirit from the Virgin, hanged on the cross, etc. It is sacrificed and partaken of in the Supper. The same Spirit, which created Christ in the Virgin, also works creatively in the mystery. Only the form, colour and taste of the elements remain, for the Supper is to remain a mystery to be believed in, faith is to be exercised; but the miracle is not to terrify, or bring evil reports on Christians, as though they ate of human flesh. Nevertheless, the legends tell, that as a matter of fact, here and there, to the shaming of doubt and especially to reward ardent love of the Saviour, the elements have appeared on the altar in their true form as flesh or at least as bleeding, or in the form of a lamb or a child, slain by an angel hand.

The doctrine of Radbertus was combated by several of his eminent contemporaries, essentially from the Augustinian standpoint, *viz.* by Hraban, and on the commission of Charles the Bald, by his own fellow-monk Ratramnus, who would make the body of Christ present in the sacrament, not in substance, but in its sacramental power.

Nevertheless, in spite of weighty opposition, Radbert's conception,

¹ *Etherii et Beati adv. Elip. ll. 2.* MI. 96.

which corresponded to the spirit of the age, made more and more way in the immediate future.

2. The controversy on the Partus Virginis.

Sources : RATRAMNUS, *L. de eo, quod Christus ex virgine natus est*, M. 121, 81.
RADBERTUS, *Opusc. de partu virg.*, Ml. 120, 1268.

It is equally characteristic that the same RADBERTUS, in attachment to the patristic conceptions of an Ambrose, Jerome, and others, of a *partus virgineus*, which took place *utero clauso sine dolore et sine gemitu et sine ulla corruptione carnis* (*vid.* i. 508), the view developed from the *porta clausa* (Ezek. xlv. 1 sq.), explained as an allusion to Mary, who was not harmed even by the birth of the child. He combats a contrary opinion, that Jesus was indeed conceived in a supernatural manner by the unviolated virgin, but that the birth ensued by the natural opening of the mother's womb. This adverse opinion however is not that of Ratramnus, as is frequently alleged, as the latter decidedly adheres, to the *virgo ante partum, in partu, post partum*, and makes Christ proceed through this *porta clausa* in the same way as He did out of the closed tomb and through the closed doors to the disciples, and only combats an opinion which made its appearance in Germany, that Christ had left his mother's womb by a different (monstrous) way from that of other children.

3. The Gottschalkian Controversy.

Sources : MAUGIN, *Veterum auctorum qui IX. sæc. de prædest. et gratia scripserunt*, Par. 1650, 2 pts.

A much greater movement was called forth by the Gottschalkian controversy. Gottschalk, the son of a Saxon Count Bern, presented (*oblatus*) as a child to the monastery of Fulda, had attempted in the self-confidence of the free Saxon, to free himself from the monastic yoke which had been enforced upon him. A Synod of Mayence of 829 actually declared in favour of the remission of the vow. But Hraban, through his influence on Lewis the Pious, procured the declaration that this was prohibited.¹ Gottschalk was relegated to the monastery of Orbais in the diocese of Soissons, there threw himself with passionate energy into theological studies, especially of Augustine and his disciple Fulgentius. Without the knowledge of his bishop he received priestly consecration from the regionary bishop of Rheims. In his wanderings through Italy, Dalmatia and Pannonia, this restless man raised offence by his abrupt assertion of the Augustinian doctrine of predestination, which he also expressly propounded at a synod at Mayence under the presidency of Hraban

¹ *Hrab. contra eos qui repugnant institutis b. p. Benedicti opp.*, Ml. 110.

in 847, accusing his opponents, and Hraban also, of Semi-pelagianism. But the synod, under Hraban's influence, rejected his doctrine, and Gottschalk was handed over to his metropolitan, Hincmar of Rheims, who, at the West-Frankish Synod of Kiercy in 849, caused Gottschalk to be deprived of his priestly rank, and compelled by cruel treatment to a sort of recantation, the burning of a treatise drawn up by Gottschalk in his own defence; Gottschalk was handed over to the monastery of Hautvilliers, in the diocese of Rheims, for perpetual imprisonment.

While the Church on the whole, with all its high veneration for Augustine, without coming to a clear understanding of the matter, had refrained from drawing the full consequence of the Augustinian doctrine of grace, and the spirit of ecclesiastical practice often led away pretty widely from him, Gottschalk as a matter of fact was conscious of being at one with Augustine, and indeed with just cause, even though he was much less determined by the points of view of Augustinian anthropology, than by the abstract point of view of the unalterableness of the omnipotent God. He at the same time does not shun the *expression*, once avoided by Augustine, of a double predestination (of the elect to life, of the reprobate to death). From predestination he draws the consequence of the irresistibility of grace and the so-called particularity of the divine will of grace. God does not actually will that **all** men should be saved.

The severe treatment of Gottschalk by Hincmar caused a whole series of the most important theologians of the West-Frankish kingdom to come forward more or less decidedly in favour of Augustine as attacked in the person of Gottschalk; such were PRUDENTIUS of Troyes, SERVATUS LUPUS, RATRAMNUS and others. Hincmar also occasioned JOHANNES SCOTUS to enter into the literary conflict in opposition to Gottschalk (*De dogm. prædestinationis*), but his treatment of the problem from the standpoint of his speculative hypothesis only called forth aggravated offence among the ecclesiastical theologians, and incited Prudentius, who had previously been his friend, as well as the theologians of the Church of Lyons, who had formerly occupied a more compromising attitude (Archbishop Remigius, *De tribus Epistolis*, and Florus the Deacon), to so much the stronger opposition. At the renewed Synod of **Kierzy** in 853, the four *Capitula Carisiacensia*, set up by Hincmar, were adopted. Instead of the predestination of the reprobate to punishment, they set up the predestination of the punishment for the reprobate, acknowledged the loss of the freedom of the will in Adam and its restoration by Christ, but asserted the **universality** of the divine

will of grace, and ascribed entirely to the unbelief or dead belief of men, that the merit of Christ did not avail for all. But shortly thereafter Prudentius came forward with other propositions, which asserted the particularity of the divine will of grace, and found therefor the approbation of a Parisian Synod of the Archbishopric of Sens. Remigius of Lyons also rose up against Hincmar, and a synod of the three South-Lotharingian ecclesiastical provinces at **Valence**, set up six propositions against those of Hincmar, which were intended to do more justice to the doctrine of Augustine, but yet sought half and half expressions, because the harsh predestination principles of Gottschalk were seen to threaten the reality of the saving operations of the Church and the power of the sacraments. An opposition of the Emperor Lothar to Charles and Hincmar co-operated to aggravate the discord. But also when Charles the Bald sought alliance with his two nephews Lothar II. of Lotharingia and Charles of Provence against Lewis the German, the **Provençal Bishops**, before the council at **Savonières** near Toul which was set on foot for the purpose of common arrangement of political and ecclesiastical affairs, first assembled in **Langres** in 859 and adopted the six canons of Valence, but avoided express censure of the propositions of **Kierzy**. At **Savonières**, where the reading of those canons threw Valent. Hincmar into great excitement, the matter was postponed; also at the French national synod at Toucy near Toul (October, 860) it did not come the length of discussion, and Hincmar, now at the height of his influence, was only able to throw out expressions in the sense of the four Cap. Carisiac. and side-glances at the *novi Prædestinatiani* in a synodal missive issued by him on other business. The matter did not reach an actual decision, though Pope NICHOLAS seems in 859 to have expressed his approval of the propositions of Valence and Langres, so that the imprisoned Gottschalk remained a dangerous enemy for Hincmar. From his prison Gottschalk attacked Hincmar on another matter. The latter had taken objection to the phrase: *te trina deitas unaque poscimus*, in the ecclesiastical hymn: *Sanctorum meritis inclyta gaudia*, and would have substituted for it *te sancta deitas*, because the expression *trina* did not fit *deitas* as the designation of the invisible Divine Being; but by his correction he aroused great offence, and Gottschalk, as indeed Ratramnus also, attacked him on the subject with his pen. Gottschalk was treated with increased severity in his prison; he was deprived of the communion of the Church, and finally also of the use of his pen, and he, to whom Hincmar appeared in the light of Anti-Christ, died without reconciliation with the Church about 868 or 869.

3. The Tenth and the first half of the Eleventh Century.

In **Anglo-Saxon** England the inundation of the Danes and internal conflicts checked the upward impulse given by Alfred (*vid.* p. 201). Along with general moral and ecclesiastical conditions, the state of culture also sank. The powerful Archbishop DUNSTAN of Canterbury (p. 191) exerted himself both in the establishment of discipline in the monasteries and in the promotion of culture. At the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century these exertions were continued in a prominent manner by the Benedictine monk ÆLFRIC, who has been identified at one time with the like-named Archbishop of Canterbury (ob. 1006), at another with a somewhat later Archbishop of York, but in both cases erroneously. Apart from ecclesiastical writings (*De consuetudine monachorum*, *Canones ecclesiastici*) he gained merit by fostering the Saxon language (Latin-Saxon grammar with a glossary) and translations into it (*Heptateuch*). His Homilies (*sermones catholici*) in Anglo-Saxon are free translations from Jerome, Bede and others, *vid.* Dietrich, *Abt. Aelfrik*, in *ZhTh* 1853.

In **Italy** the schools of the "grammarians" kept up interest in secular *i.e.* heathen-classical literature, and being much attended by laymen, spread among them a tolerable degree of culture, of such a kind, it is true, as lived without internal contact with the Church, on mere imitation of antique conceptions. An example of culture of this character is supplied in the beginning of the tenth century by the Panegyricus Berengarii (*vid.* E. Dümmler, *Gesta Berengarii*. Halle 1871). LIUTPRAND of Cremona also entirely betrays the influence of this classical school. Having grown up at the court of King Hugh, he became the chancellor of King Berengar, on whose commission he went to Constantinople, where he acquired familiarity with the Greek language and with the circumstances of the Byzantine Empire. After the rupture with Berengar he attached himself to Otto I., who made him Bishop of Cremona in 962. He wrote a history of his time with a polemical tendency against Berengar and his wife Willa, as his personal opponents, under the title *Antapodosis*, a treatise on the deposition of John XII., and a report on his embassy to Constantinople as bride-winner for Otto II. Opp. in MGS. III., 264 and SrG. I. 2nd ed. ed. Dümmler, Hanover 1877. For the rest the Italy of the tenth century forms the stage of ceaseless conflicts and political factions, in which Germans, Frenchmen and Burgundians also interfere, and at the same time of a fleshly dissoluteness and insolence in sin which increased to an incredible degree and against which the humanistic culture afforded no protection. The Church and the clergy stand at the lowest point of mental and moral culture; in Rome itself the thickest darkness of ignorance prevails and the highest insolence of sin in league with the coarsest sensual superstition. RATHERIUS, who was born in the diocese of Liège, came with Hilduin (afterwards Archbishop of Milan) to Italy, and as Bishop of Verona was personally involved in the factions of the time, and is a representative of higher culture and more serious ecclesiastical effort. Not without his own fault he was restlessly tossed about, and subsequently was also temporarily Bishop of Liège (died 974). His writings (ed. Ballerini 1765, Ml. 136) afford us glimpses of the sunken condition of the culture of the clergy (*vid.* A. Vogel, *R. von V. und das 10. Jh.*, 2 vols. Jena 1854).

In **Germany** many monastic schools had remained the protectors of ecclesiastical culture. Fulda, Hirschau, Corvey and above all **S. Gall**, the flourishing period of which, as regards the monastic school also, had begun under Lewis

the German's arch-chaplain Grimoald (841-872) on whom he bestowed S. Gall, and had continued into the tenth century. Here the so-called *inner school* (Iso) worked at the up-bringing of the boys who were destined for monkhood, and the *outer school* (Moengal or Marcellus) for the nobility, who here received their equipment for posts as canons and bishops. The elder NOTKER (Balbulus, the Stammerer) worked here till his death in 912. He is the author of a martyrology and is especially famous on account of his **Sequence-poems** (*vid.* Meyer v. Knonau, *Lebensbild des h. Notker v. St. gallen, Mitth. der antiqu. Ges.* XIX., Zürich 1877 cf. Chap. V. under 2.) Alongside of poetry and the sciences, music and various sorts of artistic skill, especially miniature painting, flourished at S. Gall. The famous Bishop Solomon III. of Constance (890-920), at the same time Abbot of S. Gall, represents the culture fostered by S. Gall (*vid.* E. Dümmler, *St. Gallische Denkmale aus der karolingischen Zeit in the Mittheilungen d. antiquar. Gesellsch.*, XII. 6, 1859, and *id.* *Das formelbuch des Bischofs Salomo von Constanx*, cf. WATTE., I. 257).

From the profound convulsions of the time of the fall of the Carolingians and the frightful invasions of the Hungarians, the Saxon Ludoltings, Henry I. and Otto I., led to a new upward movement. These were indeed times of conflict and the sword, but also of new impulses for the intellectual life. Otto's brother BRUN, of Cologne, especially, in spite of his enormous activity as Chancellor and Arch-chaplain of the Empire, distinguished himself by industrious literary zeal, attracted all the men of the time who were prominent in culture, invited foreign scholars, especially from Italy (the grammarian Gunzo of Novara), utilized the presence of the Greeks at the court for advancement in Greek scholarship, worked himself as a teacher, and made the royal chancery a seed-plot for able bishops.¹ Otto II. received his careful scientific education, and the women of the imperial house, Adelheid and the Greek Theophano were eminent in literary culture. Noble ladies in general were at that time in a better position than the men of lay rank to appropriate the beginnings of literary culture: reading, writing, Latin, in order to read the Psalter, and introduction to the world of books under clerical instigation.

Although the inward opposition of ecclesiastical ideas to the foundations of classical culture, ever and again made graceful occupation with the antique authors, especially the poets, appear as a kind of diabolic temptation, the instinctive feeling of the need of maintaining them as the supports of culture, preponderated. Even the Corvey monk Widukind, who glorifies the deeds of Henry and Otto as those of his own Saxon family, seeks carefully and clumsily enough to clothe his language in a classical, Sallustian robe. But classical schooling and mastery of form is shown in a high degree by the nun closely related to the imperial house, ROSWITHA (Hrotsuit) of Gandersheim, who there under Abbess Gerberga (the daughter of Duke Henry of Bavaria), celebrated in Latin verses the *gesta Ottonis primi* and the *Primordia canobii Gandershemensis*, and composed *comediæ sacræ* after the model of the plays of Terence, and who sought to retain their charm along with Christian matter, in order to drive out the heathen and offensive comedies of the favourite Terence.²

OTRICH, who passed as one of the most learned men of his time, worked at the cathedral school of the newly-founded archbishopric of Magdeburg. A great number of capable bishops appeared, such as Bishop Ecbert of Trèves, from the school of Bruno (977-93), a patron and promoter of ecclesiastical artis-

¹ *Vid.* Ruotge vita S. BRUNONIS, MGS. IV. 252.

² Opp. ed. Barak, Nürnberg 1858. Lit. in Wattenbach I. 247.

tic activity, further on Bishop THIETMAR of Merseburg (1009–1019), educated in Magdeburg, and the admirable BERNWARD, who from 987 had the conduct of the education of the young Otto III. at the court, and then from 992–1022 was Bishop of **Hildesheim**, and combined scientific culture with care for the arts. (His life by Thangmar in MGS., IV. 754.)

In connection with the efforts after monastic reform, such as were also made by Brun in **Lotharingia**, which was entrusted to him, a new intellectual life began to be active. Metz, Utrecht, and other places gained importance, especially **Liège**, from which Ratherius had gone out, and where also a certain Notker, formerly provost in S. Gall, raised the school to high prosperity at the end of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh centuries. Not less did the school of S. Gall now take a new upward leap under the second NOTKER, the most famous of this name, the German (also called Labeo). By his translations and expositions (*libri expositionum*), classico-philosophical and biblical writings, in which for purposes of instruction, the German language appears mixed to a greater or less degree with the Latin, he essentially promoted scientific culture.¹ A disciple of his, who survived till after the middle of the eleventh century, was Ekkehard (IV.), the author of the *Casus St. Galli*, of such great interest for the history of civilization (MGS., II. 74–147, and edited with explanations by Meyer v. Knonau in *St. Galler Geschichts-Quellen*, III. 1877 [*Mittheilungen zur Vaterl. Gesch.* XV. and XVI.]), which gave Scheffel the opportunity for his Ekkehard (the first, who lived in the first half of the tenth century). His contemporary, HERMANN, of Reichenau (Herm. Contractus), the author of the first mediæval world-chronicle, is famed as a teacher, and also on account of his mathematical and astronomical knowledge, as well as a poet and musician, † 1054. (Bauermann in St. Kr. 1869, 103–118.)

In **France** an important learned activity of the so-called Schoolmen directed towards grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics, was maintained from the ninth century. Among the monasteries, that of **S. Arnaud**, in the Hennegau, makes itself notable, where the learned monk, HUCBALD (Calvus), lived, whom Bishop FULKO of Rheims (882 sqq.) made use of in raising the Rheims school, which had entirely sunk into decay. In Rheims FLOBOARD († 906), the continuator of the Rheims Annals and author of the *Historia Remensis*, distinguished himself in the tenth century; he celebrated the history of Christ and the primitive Church, as well as that of the bishops of Rome, in fourteen books of Hexameters.

ABBO of Fleury wrought for a time in England, and afterwards as Abbot of the monastery of Fleury († 1004), both for monastic discipline and also in support of scientific efforts by numerous writings, and contributed to the promotion of the **dialectical training**, for which the scholastic theology had prepared the way.

But it is especially GERBERT (*vid.* p. 179) who brilliantly represents the aspiring scientific power of the age. His study in Spain with Bishop Hatto has given rise to the legend of his apprenticeship to the Arabs; nevertheless the fostering of the sciences in **Arabian Spain** may also have worked favourably on the Christian pursuit of

¹ There are preserved: Aristotle's Categories, Boethius *De Consol. philos.*, 1, and Marcianus Capella. In the text-book of Rhetoric, examples from German popular song are also adduced. *Vid.* HATTEMER, *St. Gallens altdeutsche Sprachschütze*, vols. ii. and iii.

the sciences. He taught at the school of Rheims with great repute. The course of study which he followed rested on the traditional seven liberal arts. He explained the writings of the ancients, the *Isagoge* of Porphyry, Aristotle's *Categories*, and *περὶ ἑρμηνείας*, Cicero's *Logic* and writings of Boethius; the poets, Virgil, Statius, and others, were read as a preparation for rhetoric. Then followed exercises in disputation; finally as the completion of the instruction, the *Quadrivium*: arithmetic, music, astronomy, and geometry. A man of brilliant talent, he also grasped the idea of science or philosophy as a comprehensive organism of knowledge. His scientific attitude is preponderatingly and almost exclusively **secular**, pursuing classical, rational and realistic interests; but this richly-gifted and worldly-wise man knows all the same how to throw himself into the attitude of the strict churchman.

Among the learned men who proceeded from the school of Gerbert, **Fulbert** stands pre-eminent by his success as a teacher; he was the founder of the school of **Chartres**, which soon won great esteem, and where also he was finally bishop († 1029).

An example of the increase of delight in dialectical disputation is given by that **ANSELM** the Peripatetic,¹ who, wandering over Germany, exhibited the lustre of Italian higher schools, but here also found those who were a match for him.

¹ E. Dümmeler, *Ans. d. Per.*, 1872.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

Ecclesiastical Life.

1. Christian Instruction.

Sources : MÜLLENHOFF u. SCHERER, *vid. sup.* p. 119. WACKERNAGEL, *attd. Predigt, etc.*, CRUEL, and LINSSENMAIER *ibid.*—HELIAND, edited by SIEVERS. ZACHER's Germanist. Handbibel, vol. 4, 1878, cf. SIEVERS *Zd.A.*, vol. 19, 1876. —OTFRID of Weissenburg, *Evangelienbuch*, Text. and Introd. by Kelle, 1856. by PIPER, 1878. ERDMANN, 1882. LAHMANN in *Ersch. u. Grub.*, and in *Kl. Schriften*, 449 sqq.

1. AN attempt was made at first to maintain the Carolingian foundations of **Christian popular instruction** by means of the Church. The bishops are repeatedly reminded of the duty of preaching, which they ought to perform themselves or through others. The endeavours after renovation after the disorders of the end of the Carolingian period (Synod of Hohenaltheim in 916 under Conrad I.) assert the same point of view, and to it corresponds the repeated inculcation of the duty of laymen to attend the preaching with their households, and the censure of men of rank who can hear mass in their chapels, and therefore absolve themselves from attendance at the parish churches.

In this matter the Carolingian ordinance is maintained, that the bishops and presbyters should supply themselves with collections of homilies by the orthodox fathers, and instruct those under their charge accordingly, so that every one might understand them (Capitulary of Mayence of 847, cf. p. 120). HRABAN also expounded Holy Scripture to his scholars in the language of the country.—But the practice remains far behind the requirements. People contented themselves here with elementary catechetical instruction, the inculcation of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer in Latin and German, or even merely in the latter; there are traces of *sermones ad populum teutonice* in a book-list of the tenth century. In the **Saxon** region there are glosses to the Homilies of Gregory the Great, intended to help the glossator's lecture, an address for All Saints' Day.¹

In the tenth and in the first half of the eleventh century we only hear of individual prominent bishops, who, travelling about in their dioceses, preach to the assembled multitude and, in part, make a deep impression, such as Bishop ULRICH, of Augsburg († 973), WOLFGANG of Ratisbon († 994); these sermons may partly also have had the character of brief catechetical inculcation. ARNO of Cologne also exerted himself on his entrance upon his see to check the pro-

¹ WACKERNAGEL *l.c.* 315 sq. Cf. also the remains of German sermons, translation, extracts and revision of Latin homilies of the fathers in Cruel, p. 96 sqq.

found ignorance of the people. It is narrated of the famous Bishop GODEHARD of Hildesheim (the successor of Bernward, † 1038), that where he heard that the common people were streaming together to a saint's festival or the consecration of a church, he hastened thither to preach on the love of God and one's neighbour, Christian faith and conduct, the confession of sins and care for souls.

WACKERNAGEL has alluded to the fact that the intellectual life and the usage of language of the German people were as yet little prepared for prose and didactics. In the Saxon region the Christian epic of the **Heliand**, the poetical work of a clerical author under Lewis the Pious, must, so far as its influence reached, have been infinitely more effective than any sermon whatever. It was a life of Christ on the basis of the so-called Tatianic Harmony of the Gospels by Victor of Capua, which brought the Gospel near to the popular spirit, and preached a German Christ. The poem **Muspilli**, on the burning of the world, the war of Anti-Christ, and the last Judgment, seeks to move men to care for their souls by holding up heaven and hell before them. This object may also be perceived in the Gospel-book of OTFRID of Weissenburg, although in it the execution is much less popular.

2. Church and Divine Worship.

Literature: 1. *vid.* i. 495, and i. 21; ii. 112. 2. SCHUBIGER, *Die Sängerschule von St. Gallen vom 8. bis 12. Jh.* Einsiedeln und New York 1858. MEYER v. KNONAU in his *Anm. zu Ekkehard's (IV.) Casus St. Galli* (*vid.* p. 207). E. DÜMMLER, *St. Gall. Denkmale d. Karl. Zeit*, Zur. 1859 (Mitth. d. antiquar. Ges. XII.). MEYER v. KNONAU, *vid.* p. 208. DÜMMLER in NA., NF. III. 267 sqq. F. WOLF, *Lais, Sequenzen und Leiche*. Hdlb. 1841. K. F. BARTSCH, *Die lat. Sequenzen d. MA.* Rost. 1868.

1. For the religious sentiment of the people the main weight already hangs on the **visible appearance** of the Church, its institutions and acts of worship. In the **churches and monastic buildings** the nation learns to reverence the centres, from which the powers of religion issue forth over its life. Hence the great Christian civilizing mission which is conducted by the clergy and monks is conducted to no small degree by the fostering of the arts and artistic skill, above all of **architecture**, in the service of the sanctuary.

It was Roman and Byzantine elements, which, modified by the Gothic and Lombard architecture of Upper Italy, gained influence on the Carolingian period. Charlemagne's palace-chapel at **Aix-la-Chapelle** recalled edifices at Ravenna (S. Vitale), and the circular plan here given also found imitation here and there in subsequent times, as may already be recognised from the building plan which came from Fulda to S. Gall in the time of Lewis the Pious about 830.¹ Of the

¹ *Vid.* in DEHIO u. BEZOLD, plate 42, 2.

buildings of the Carolingian time only few surely demonstrable ruins are preserved, as in the ruins of a monastery at **Steinbach**, and in the church at Michelstadt in the Odenwald, founded by Einhard, and consecrated in 821; in the case of important buildings of the Romance period, it remains doubtful how much of them belongs to the Carolingian age. In Germany, in the ninth and tenth centuries, wooden building still entirely predominates. From scanty beginnings, often only sufficient for the primary requisite, in the decaying Carolingian age, there arose again in the tenth century, with the increasing prosperity and the increased resources of the **Ottonian** period, a lively activity in the building of churches and monasteries, which at the close of our period, in the first half of the eleventh century, when many wooden churches were replaced by stone, led to important monuments of the **Romance style**, which developed itself in manifold local peculiarities according to a common type. For Germany, the **Saxon** home of the ruling house, where German Government and the German Church sought to obtain a firm footing in conflict with the **Wends**, and the Rhine-land, with its rich resources, are especially important seats of this activity in building: **Quedlinburg**, **Merseburg**, **Magdeburg**, and the foundation of the powerful Margrave Gero, the cathedral-church at **Gernrode** (960), the plan and oldest portions of which belong to this ancient time, then also **Hildesheim**, where, under the admirable **BERNWARD** (998-1022) the Church of St. Michael arose (consecrated in 1033). Elsewhere also capable bishops and abbots promoted activity in building.—About the same time King Conrad II. founded the cathedral at **Spire** (1030), in the royal vault of which under the transept and choir he was laid in 1039. The beginnings of the Cathedral of **Mayence** reach back as far as Archbishop Willigis (976), the round towers of the east side at least to the eleventh century. On these as on other buildings the following period, building further, developed the Romance style from its initial simplicity and massiveness into greater refinement and elegance. But even the present period, while maintaining the fundamental type of the basilica and its peculiarities (predominance of **horizontal lines** and the **round arch**) developed Romance church-architecture independently. While smaller churches attached themselves more closely to the simple form of the ancient basilica, in the case of larger cathedral and monastic edifices we find the expansion of the apse into the more extensive space of the choir, which affords a special place for the increased number of the priesthood in the sanctuary of the church in contrast to the laity, and room for the pomp of the sacred functions. Connected therewith is the formation of the building after the form of the Latin cross. The frequent arrangement of **crypts** under the choir causes the latter to be raised by several steps above the nave of the laity.

Partly the needs of large monastic communities, partly regard to the patron saints which had to be honoured in the church, or to the providing of a worthy place of burial for the founder of the church, leads to the erection, which properly departs from the idea of the basilica, of a second (western) choir opposite the eastern (chief-) choir; in consequence a second transept may also be formed. The plan of S. Gall already shows the double choir; but the oldest example seems to be afforded by the monastic church of Centula (St. Riquier)¹ in Normandy, built by Abbot Angilbert in the last years of the eighth century.

2. With the carrying out of the **Roman order of worship**, Charlemagne had also required the cultivation of the **Gregorian chant** in

¹ In DEHIO u. BEZOLD, plate 43, 1.

the mass and office (service of the Hours), which indeed excluded the active co-operation of the laity, but not a little exalted the solemnity of Divine worship. In connection with the zealous cultivation of Latin poetry of all sorts in the Carolingian circle, the **composition of ecclesiastical hymns** progresses, represented by Theodulf of Orleans, Walafried Strabo, Florus, and many authors who have remained anonymous. In these hymns, mostly devoted to the praise of the saints, the **rhythmical** formation of the verses (cf. i. 439, 468) has already completely ousted the prosodic. To the seven *artes liberales*, according to the traditional model, **music** also belonged, the cultivation of which occupies an important place, exactly in reference to Divine worship, among the efforts which proceeded from the Carolingian epoch of culture. A musical peculiarity of the liturgical priest's chant led to the emergence of the important **sequences** alongside of the hymns.

The monk HUCBALD, of S. Amand, who also worked for some time in the cathedral school of Rheims, and died about 930 in S. Amand of a great age, treated of music (Ml. 132, 826 sqq.) in various writings, on the basis of the traditional Greek musical system, but not without independence and criticism, and attempted to replace the older notation by *pneumata* by a more intelligible writing of the notes.

Just as ecclesiastical music was cultivated in the cathedral schools of the Frankish Empire, so was it especially in the monastic school of S. Gall (SCHUBIGER, *Die Sängerschule von St. Gallen von 8. bis 12. Jh.*, Einsiedeln und New York 1858), where, according to the tradition, one of the singers (Romanus) sent by Hadrian I. to Charlemagne for the reform of ecclesiastical song is said to have remained, while the other went to Metz. Singing and poetry are here closely intertwined. Notker the Stammerer (*vid. sup.* p. 207) in youth already experienced the need of making more retainable for the memory the longer musical phrases, in which on feast-days the Hallelujah of the *graduate* died away without words.¹ A priest from the monastery of Gimiedia (Jumièges), destroyed by the Normans (862), brought with him to S. Gall an antiphonary, in which words were supplied for this **sequence-melody**. Notker's attempt to improve this method of procedure, led to the **poetical composition** of sequences, which has made his name celebrated. The **sequences** consisted of series of different musical sentences, of which each except the first and the last (as a *rule*, at all events) was repeated once (frequently performed by the double choir); corresponding to this are the sequence **texts**, the substance of which is taken from the subject of the ecclesiastical festival, formed of a series of lines (*versus, versiculi*) of different length, but of which apart from the first and the last, every two had an equal number of syllables. They were prose lines **without definite alternation of rise and fall**, hence the sequences were also called *proses*. Of the sequences which go under Notker's name, forty-one are to be recognised as genuine, according to Wilmann's investigation (ZdA. N.F., III. 267).² Notker's

¹ Therefore on *a*, probably also on both the last syllables of Hallelujah.

² Collection in DANIEL, *Thesaur. Hymnolog.*, SCHUBIGER l.c., and KEHREIN, *lat. Sequenzen d. MA. ges.*, Mainz 1873.

sequences soon enjoyed great popularity, and imitated and subsequently (from the beginning of the following period) transformed into rhymed strophes, introduced an **essential enrichment of divine service at festivals and of ecclesiastical poetry**. Related to this is the attempt of Notker's contemporary and fellow-monk TUOTILO, who distinguished himself in all sorts of artistic skill, to expand other mass chants, especially the Introit and Kyrie, in a similar manner in the so-called **Tropes**.

Acts of worship of manifold character do indeed encroach upon the popular life beyond the walls of the church, rogations (litanies), and processions, etc. ; but the office of the **mass**, with its rich liturgical equipment always formed the climax. Theologians of the Carolingian age apply much attention to the elucidation and explanation of its usages (Amalarius, Hraban, Walafried), but the believing multitude, without understanding the details, sees in it the **function which in itself exercised saving (magical) power**. Hence the personal presence and communion of the believers who are to be benefited by them, at the numerous masses founded for special purposes (*vid. sup.* p. 113), begin to be no longer looked upon as indispensable. The performance by the priest, in accordance with the foundation (of course, with the presence of the one or more administering assistants), is sufficient to secure the object intended by the foundation of the mass. This result of the mass as **soul-mass** extends its influence beyond this life to those for whom the soul-mass is founded. After an ecclesiastical celebration for the departed had arisen at an earlier time, the **Feast of All Souls**, which was assigned to the 2nd November, spread from Clugny. A pilgrim, returning from Jerusalem, believed himself to have seen the entrance to purgatory in the Lipari Islands, and to have perceived that souls were delivered out of purgatory by the prayers of the pious at Clugny.

3. The Worship of Saints and Relics.

Literature: *vid.* i. 504. and Gieseler, II. 1, 307 sqq. On the **Martyrologies**, RE. 1, 121 sqq. and Wattb., I. 58.

The dominant interest of popular piety in all ranks, circles quite peculiarly around the saints and their relics. For religious fancy they represent the *præsentia numinis*. The chief altar (high altar) is dedicated to the patron saints of the church, and in larger churches along with the number of the relics the number of the by- or side-altars increases, of which the building-plan of S. Gall already shows a considerable total.

Along with the cautious Carolingian conception of the worship of images (*vid. sup.* Synod of Paris in 825, with express censure of the papal standpoint), emi-

nent men of this period also show a more evangelical conception of the **worship of images**. Such was AGOBARD of Lyons, who feared that it would prejudice the Divine honour, and CLAUDIUS, of Turin, who attempted to proceed to the radical abolition of images, but also found decided opposition. If the earlier more cautious attitude towards the image question may still be recognised for some time (*e.g.* in Hincmar), it more and more fell into the background. But from the beginning greater importance attached to the **worship of relics**, which was indissolubly linked with the worship of saints. In the miracles which were worked by the sacred remains of the saints, the omnipotence of the God of the Christians was as it were demonstrated *ad oculos*. Thus Count Waltpert, a descendant of Widukind, when he had sought forgiveness for his sins in Rome at the graves of the holy Apostles by their intercession, asked for relics to take back with him to his Saxon home, where (he said) the people still adhered more to heathen worship and superstition than to the true religion, in order that by their signs and miraculous power the majesty and greatness of the Almighty God, whom these saints had served here below, might shine out publicly upon all men, both believers and unbelievers.¹

On occasion of the **translations** which were carried out with great ecclesiastical ceremonies and pageantries, the desired miracles and signs were wont to make their appearance. Hence **relics**, often of the most singular sort, turn up in numbers; as a rule, they were bones of the alleged saint, but also such things as tears of Christ, milk of the Virgin Mary, blood of Christ (Reichenau), the sacred spear with which Christ's side was pierced, nails from His cross, even the staff of Moses, etc.²

Although Pope Gregory IV. (827-44) could not fulfil the prayer of Otto of Mayence for a saint's body, because as yet none had been found (Jaffé, 2584), such things were constantly brought from Rome and Italy in general, and by pilgrims from the Holy Land, and were also discovered elsewhere by pious industry, or provided by fraudulent tricksters.³ And the people were always ready to believe miracles of them. Nor was there lack of those who were ready to respond to the need of miracles by feigned cures, etc. But others also, as is said, begged their saints to make an end of their miracles, because the concourse of the worshipping and help-seeking crowds undermined the peace and order of the monastery, and especially because the youth found in them the best opportunity of escaping strict rule.

It was often sought to gain assurance of the genuineness of the relics by the **ordeal by fire**. The magical graces of the saints seemed to justify every means of obtaining possession of them. When the hermit, ROMUALD, who was venerated as very holy, and stood in great repute in Catalonia, determined to return thence to Italy, the rude multitude would have had him murdered, in order that, since they could not keep him alive, they might at least keep his body as that of their tutelary patron. He only escaped by feigning madness. Hence it also appeared allowable, and even praiseworthy, to purloin relics by deceit and

¹ *Vid. Translatio Alexandri* by Rudolf and Meginhard in Fulda, 2nd half of the ninth century MGS., II. 678 translated by Richter, Berl. 1856. Cf. *Translatio LIBORII* by Bishop Boso of Paderborn in the time of King Arnulf (MGS., IV. 149): "So those also, who did not believe the words of the preachers on the omnipotence of God, would yet believe that which they had seen with their own eyes and which they could experience as a benefit to themselves."

² *Vid.* the list of 801 in Gieseler, II. 1, 154 and 309.

³ *Vid.* Glabe Rad. on the year 1027 in Gieseler, II. 1, 308.

fraud, just as Bishop OTWIN, of Hildesheim, having come to Italy in the retinue of Otto I., obtained possession by deceit of the corpse of S. Epiphanius in Pavia in 964.¹

The **martyrological literature** (*vid.* i. 504), which was cultivated with special predilection in the ninth century, corresponded to the worship of the saints. Out of the lists of the anniversaries of the deaths of the martyrs and saints who were to be remembered at mass, there grew up such as also contained notices of the lives of the martyrs and confessors.

To the oldest martyrologies, that which is erroneously ascribed to **Jerome**, that of Bede, which was very widely spread, and which is only preserved in the revision of Florus Mag. Lugd., there were attached those of HRABAN (845), ADO of Vienne (about 860), and USUARDUS (Husward), composed about 875, at the desire of Charles the Bald, as also the martyrology in verse of Wandalbert of Prüm (851); finally, the above-mentioned martyrology of NOTKER (Balbul. † 912), which attached itself to ADO, and the likewise poetical one by the monk ERCHEMPERT of Monte Casino.

But the short accounts of the martyrologies did not satisfy the needs of edification. The custom which had sprung from the ancient Church, of publicly reading the acts of the martyrs on their feast days, had indeed been gainsaid by the so-called *Decr. Gelasianum de libris recipiendis* (i. 349), and it was not uniformly carried out; but Pope Hadrian I., permitted the custom, and not merely to the respective communities to which the martyrs had belonged, but also to others (E. Martène, *de antiquis eccles. ritibus*. Antw. 1737, IV. 5).

In addition, the need of the monasteries, to bring forward their monastic saints for purposes of edification, contributed to the extraordinary multiplication of the literature of the **lives of the saints**, which had long been naturalized. For us it is a copious historical source, but one which certainly frequently flows very turbidly, inasmuch as the historical interest disappears entirely in favour of the interest of the cultus.

For relics, once present, with arbitrary or obscure names, stories of saints had to be invented as a necessary requisite; local saints, who actually had traditions, were at least as far as possible transported back into the apostolic age, and the lives and miracles of unknown saints formed after the model of other legends. Anastasius Bibliothecarius (p. 201), who was also so influential otherwise as a translator, is important for the bringing over into the West of the wanton exuberance of the Greek legendary literature. A lively exchange took place between the Greek and the Latin Church. *Vid. inf.*, Chap. VI. No. 3. Wolfhard of Herrieden (beginning of the tenth century) is already mentioned as the author of a comprehensive *Legendarium* (MGS., VII. 256).

Canonization was at first the result of local tradition, but was afterwards exercised by metropolitans for their sees. But to the ancient saints there were added individuals closely connected with the time, and here the popes chiefly

¹ *Translatio S. Epiph.*, MGS., IV. 248.

interfered; ULRICH of Augsburg († 973), the bishop who was celebrated on account of his services to the city in the Hungarian war, his lavish ecclesiastical benevolence, his asceticism and promotion of monastic life, was expressly canonized twenty years after his death (993) by Pope John XV. at the request of his successor. As God is honoured in the saints, so by their **merit and intercession** the Divine grace is also mediated for men. The notions on this point often appear in the crassest form. A rich man, living in worldly luxury, who, besides his name of being a Christian and his dead faith, had no other merit except that, being devoted to S. Cæsarius, he frequently attended his church and presented wax candles, is said to have been called back to life once more after his death, and to have recounted, that being already on the point of being seized by the black devils, he was released on the prayer of S. Cæsarius, with whom the mother of God and all the saints concurred.¹ In other narratives the Virgin Mary interferes with the most ingenuous partiality for her worshippers, even when otherwise they are characters of the worst sort.

There are frequent conflicts over the possession of similar valuable saints, *i.e.* of their relics, such as that between the monks of S. Dionysius near Paris, and those at S. Emmeran in Ratisbon, that between the Benedictines of Monte-Casino and those of Fleury near Orleans (whither AIGULF, in the seventh century, is said to have brought the bones of Benedict, purloined from the original monastery which was laid waste by the Lombards).

Of the great number of the saints the Holy **Virgin**, the *semper virgo*, is highly exalted, and her cult encouraged by eminent men like Fulbert of Chartres, and Damiani (*vid.* the following period).²

4. Penitential Discipline and the Papal Jurisdiction.

Sources : HINCMAR, *Capitula Synodica ad presbyteros parochiæ suæ* (Ml. 125).

REGINO abb. Prumens., *libri 2 de ecclesiasticis disciplinis s. de synodaliibus causis* ed. St. Baluzius, Par. 1683 (Ml. 132), ed. Wasserschleben, 1840. H. WASSERSCHLEBEN, *die Bussordnungen der abendl. Kirche*, Halle 1851. E. FRIEDBERG, *aus deutschen Bussbb.*, Halle 1868. H. J. SCHMITZ, *vid.* p. 114. EUSEB. AMORT, *de orig., progressu, etc., indulgentiarum*, Vindol. 1735. KLUCKHOHN, *Geschichte des Gottesfriedens*, 1857. FEHR, *der Gottes Fr. u. d. Kath. Kirche*, 1861.

For Christian popular education the most important means of influence is the ecclesiastical **discipline of penance**, and especially in connection with the organization of the **episcopal synodal courts** (*vid. sup.*), with its mixed ecclesiastico-civil character, in the Frankish empire. The bishop, making one or more progresses through his diocese, is preceded by the archdeacon or archpresbyter, who convokes the people, exhorts them on pain of excommunication to appear at the synod, and along with the priests settles minor matters. The bishop received by the priests with the synodal-fare (*servitium*), preaches, confirms, visits the ecclesiastical establishments, etc., and holds judgment (in the presence of the count or his mayor) upon the grosser sins (which in the secular court were either

¹ Cruel, 91.

² Cf. Benrath, StKr., 1886, p. 209 sqq.

not punished at all, or only by fine); viz., on offences against life, adultery, harlotry and other sins of the flesh, theft and robbery, perjury and false oaths, magic and heathen superstition, as well as against numerous offences against ecclesiastical order and ecclesiastico-civil propriety. The synodal witnesses (usually seven), *testes synodales*, who were chosen by the bishop from among the *maturores, honestiores et veraciores* of the community, were bound by oath upon the relics, to answer conscientiously the **questions** of the bishop, whether in this parish a man-slayer, etc. On the complaint of one of these synodal witnesses, it is the business of the accused to purge himself (by oath, compurgator, eventually by judgment of God). The bishop with the clergy finds the verdict, and imposes the penance to be performed, even in cases when the offence has already been compensated for with money in the secular court.

The episcopal synodal courts were supplemented by the monthly district assemblies under the archpriest, *archipresb. ruralis*.¹

With the growing participation of the bishops in the government of the Empire, summons to the diets of the Empire, to diets of the court, to the imperial court of justice, to military service, especially from the time of the Saxon emperors, the care of these synodal courts falls to the archdeacons as the representatives of the bishops; their rights are further bestowed on the provosts of the cathedral chapters and collegiate foundations; and gradually (though not until the following period) the archdeacons strive to attract to themselves the right exercised *commissionis nomine*, as their own proper jurisdiction. They again have their officials or commissaries. Regino of Prüm († 915) gives us clear glimpses into the procedure of these synodal courts at the close of the ninth century.

This judicial procedure of imposing penances, of great importance for the education of the people, promotes, however, the legal and external view of religion. In the theological treatment of the subject it is true, in the conception of ecclesiastical penances in general for sins open or secret, but confessed to the priest, the penitence of the heart and painful regret are theoretically emphasized as the necessary presupposition of their saving fruit, but the conception, which descended from the ancient Church, of penance as a satisfaction which was to be offered to the Church, and ultimately to God Himself, necessarily exerted an externalizing influence, as also did this way of regarding penance, which was asserted in the synodal court, as **atonement**, i.e. as an absolving discharge of a penalty. Stress is laid upon the individual transgression and its expiation, but not upon the inward disposition.

¹ Cf. Hincmar, *Capitula a XII. episcopatus superaddita*, opp. ed. Sirm., I. 730.

But this tendency is especially strongly promoted by the practical system of penance and its deterioration by the so-called **redemptions of penance** (*vid. sup.*). In the imposition of **periods of penance** (*i.e.* above all, fasts, in certain circumstance matrimonial abstinence also) of very various lengths, use was made of the *libri pœnitentiales* (*pœnit. Romanum, Theodori Cantuar., Bedæ*)¹ formerly mentioned. In these *libri pœnit.* (as in Regino Pr. *de synod. caus.* II. 438 sqq.), in the *canones excerpti* of ABBO of Fleury († 1004), and especially in Burchardi ep. Wormat. († 1025) *conlectarium canonum*, that redemption was now defined in such a way that longer fasts might partly be replaced by **shorter** ones, with accumulated psalms and recitations of prayers, and partly by **money payment** also, in which case only the character of alms (money *ad pias causas*) was to be maintained, "*Adtendat unusquisque, cui dare debeat, sive pro redemptione captivorum, s. supra sanctum altare, sive Dei servis, sive pauperibus in eleemosynen*" (Reg.).

In the Carolingian period this procedure had still been combated, and the Synod of Châlons in 813 declared against the wide-spread *pœnitentiales* of uncertain origin, as too lax; the degree of the penitential exercises was to be regulated according to the ancient canons. Now, however, the opposition fell silent. At the synod at Tribur (895), there is found for the first time in a synodal canon the permission of the mitigation of a longer period of penance for manslaughter, by the penitent's absolving himself from strict fasting on certain days of the week by money payment (one denarius or feeding three poor persons). And this soon gains the upper hand in the manner depicted, and the confessional fees instituted for an ecclesiastical purpose, become a new source of enrichment for the Church. Resting on this are numerous donations and foundations given to churches and monasteries, with the object of atoning for a sinful life and generally of obtaining religious merit. But **vicarious penance** is also found to exist and is bought. It is undertaken, *e.g.*, by a thrall for his deceased master, after freedom has been assured him in reward for it. In this way periods of penance could be imposed, which extended far beyond a lifetime, but which were then redeemed. For the rest, in this redemption of penance by alms, weight was not merely attached to the view that alms take away sins, but also to the view that the pious

¹ According to *inquisitio* 95 prefaced in Regino Pr. lib. I., the presbyters were to be asked, whether they possessed one of those named, so as to be able to deal with those who confessed, and impose the degree of penance in accordance with it.

priest or monk takes upon himself the performance of the penance in return for receiving the alms.¹

Closely connected with this general conception of the performance of penance is the peculiar **system of indulgences**. Under condition of attendance at certain churches on the anniversary of the foundation or at other times, and obviously of presenting offerings to this church, **a part** of the imposed penance is remitted.² Indeed at the end of the period popes go so far (Benedict IX., the first to do so, so far as known) as to issue **plenary indulgence** on particular occasions, *i.e.*, entire remission of penance even for the grossest sins, under the condition, that the person should confess the sins committed to the priest and should improve in the future.

But on the other hand for grave sins (parricide, acts of violence against churches and the like) there appeared many specially severe forms of penance; scourging (*vid.* Damiani), imprisonment, exile, whence *peregrinari* (pilgrimage) is developed as a performance of penance, loading the pilgrim with chains, etc.

From the ecclesiastical penalty of **excommunication** as exclusion from the communion of the Church on account of public and notorious mortal sin until it was completely or partially expiated, there was now further distinguished the **anathema** against those who would not submit themselves to the penance of the Church. As *æternæ mortis damnatio* it might be ordained only when the sinner had evaded all other means of conversion, and forms a special weapon against heresy and also against rude violence offered to the Church. Robbers of churches are in the first place subjected to the *excommunicatio minor*; if up to a certain point of time they do not seek absolution, to the **anathema**. It involves exclusion from all Christian intercourse, the refusal of the Sacrament even in the hour of death, and of ecclesiastical burial.³

¹ According to Schmitz (l.c. 149), the mischief of **redemption of penance** would be only an abuse of the **Anglo-Saxon** and **German** Churches; in the **Roman** penitentials only regard to individual circumstances and corresponding modification of ecclesiastical penitential penalties is recommended. The general practice of redeeming penances by money, did not, he says, gain ground in Italy. But Schmitz's construction as to the existence and content of alleged **Roman penitentials** is in general untenable. It presupposes traditional practice, when ANSELM of Milan at the Synod of 1060 imposes a penance of a hundred years on account of the simony which had occurred in his church and was more widely practised, at the same time fixing the sums of money whereby the individual years might be compensated (Hefele, IV. 837).

² *Vid.*, the indulgence for a monastic church at Arles, in Gieseler, II. 1, 333.

³ *Vid.* Hefele, IV. 117, 530, cf. the *anathema terribile*, *ibid.*, 207.

Finally, in connexion with this subject, towards the end of this period the **interdict** appears. Isolated cases, where the ecclesiastical penalty, in order to make it real, was extended to the whole community to which the guilty person belonged, had already occurred at an earlier time,¹ but had also been decidedly censured (e.g., by Gerbert); but in the eleventh century it was sought by this means to create a weapon against the breaking of the peace of the country by rapacious magnates. Thus, first of all at the Synod of **Limoges**, in 1031, in France (Province of Limoges); if the quarrelsome noble any longer resisted the bishop's offer of peace, the whole neighbourhood was to be laid under excommunication. Only the clergy, beggars, aliens, and children under two years received ecclesiastical burial; mass might only be performed in silence. At the third hour of each day, at a sign given from the church, every one was to fall down and repeat penitential prayers; the sacraments of penance and the Supper were only to be extended to the mortally sick. In all churches the altars were stripped as on Good Friday, crosses and ornaments laid aside. Only during the mass, celebrated by the priests alone and with closed doors, might the altars be again covered. During the existence of the excommunication no one might marry, or eat flesh, and neither clergy nor laity might cut hair or beard.

In continuation of the same exertions, to gain the mastery in Aquitaine of the intolerable system of feuds by the application of ecclesiastical resources, the bishops (about 1033), since entire abolition of the feuds was not to be attained, grasped at the expedient of arranging that according to a common resolution no one should practise feud or violence from the evening of Wednesday till sunrise on Monday, or arbitrarily revenge or right himself, on penalty of compounding for his life or of exile and outlawry.²

The Germanic means of justice of the **ordeals**, the Church had formerly been obliged to permit, but had disapproved; she now recognised its validity, but took it under her own supervision with practical limitation. AGOBARD had declared decidedly against this undertaking to anticipate the Divine judgment, so likewise, still later, many representatives of the Church; and the Church did not cease to reject the Divine judgment of the **duel**. But otherwise, HINCMAR already defended Divine decisions (trials by fire and water). The custom for clergy of making the Holy Supper (*pro expurgatione*) a Divine decision, frequently, however, found disapprobation.

¹ Hefele, IV. 381, 490, 636.

² *Aut de vita componeret aut suorum consortio expulsus patria pelleretur.*

CHAPTER SIXTH.

The Greek Church from the end of the Image-Controversies till the Schism of 1054.

Sources : Cf. the Byzantine chroniclers; the continuation of the Chronicle of GEORGIUS MONACHUS down to 948; that of THEOPHANES, with the co-operation of the Emperor Constantine VII., whose work is the Fifth Book, and GENESIUS (*vid. sup.*, p. 2); SYMEON MAGISTER, entirely dependent on the continuator of Theophanes. LEO GRAMMATICUS, essentially a copy of the stoutly transcribed Georgius Monachus and his continuator; most closely connected with him THEODOSII MELITENI *qui fertur chronographia*, ed. Tafel, in the Monumenta Sæcularia, edited by the Kgl. bayr. Akademie der Wissensch. III. Kl., I. Theil., München 1859. For the later period LEO DIACONUS and GEORGIUS CEDRENIUS, a chronicle of the world down to 1057, come into consideration, for the last two centuries an almost verbal repetition of JOHANNES SCYLITZES, *historiarum compendia*, etc., ed. Joh. B. Gubius, Venice 1570, otherwise only accessible in a Latin translation. Cf. HIRSCH and Hertzberg, *sup.*, p. 3.

1. The Relation to the Latin Church.

Literature : LEO ALLATIUS (a Greek who had passed over to the Roman Church), *De ecclesiæ orientalis et occidentalis perpetua consensione*, Coloniae 1648. The Jesuit MAIMBOURG's *Histoire du Schisme des Grecs*, Paris 1677. German transl. by Meuser, Aachen 1841. PITZIPIOS, *L'église orientale, sa séparation et sa réunion avec celle de Rome*, Paris 1855, 4 vols. PICHLER, *Gesch. d. kirchlichen Trennung zwischen dem Orient und Occident*. Vol. I., München 1864.

THE way has already been preparing for a long time, for estrangement between the Greek Church of the Byzantine Empire and the Roman West, fostered by the independent development of the Germano-Romance West, by the attitude of the Frankish Church in the image-question¹ and the rivalry between the Frankish Emperor Charles and the Eastern Empire. In the second half of the century the fall of the Patriarch IGNATIUS gave occasion for the widening of the breach. He, the youngest son of the Emperor Michael Rhangabe, who was overthrown by Leo the Armenian in

¹ In 824, under Michael Balbus, a Greek embassy to Lewis the Pious and Pope Eugenius II., had taken place, which was intended to make use of Frankish opinion against those who were decidedly friendly to images, but the issue of the image-controversies worked against this attempt at friendly advances.

813, was mutilated along with his brother by Leo, and clapped into a monastery. As a zealous ascetic and friend of images he was raised by the Empress Theodora to the patriarchate of Constantinople. But under her youthful and dissolute son Michael III. (the Drunkard), he attracted the disfavour of Cæsar Bardas who ruled for the latter, by keeping him from the communion on account of his life, and also refused to confirm the enforced investiture of the mother and sister of the young Emperor as nuns, which had been pressed on by the advice of Bardas, by blessing the veil. He was accused of high-treasonable intrigues and banished in November, 857, and the celebrated and learned Photius, who was related to the imperial house, *Protospatar*, and first imperial secretary, and still a layman, was selected as his successor. He sought in vain to induce Ignatius to offer his resignation, and was speedily provided with the requisite consecrations, acknowledged by an assembly in Constantinople as the successor of Ignatius, and consecrated patriarch by an old opponent of the latter, Archbishop Gregorius Asbesta of Syracuse, who had been expelled by the Arabs. An older party opposition among the clergy to Ignatius was here successfully utilized by Bardas. Ignatius, namely, had, at an earlier synod, declared Gregory deposed, and had sought to gain bishops Leo IV. and Benedict III. of Rome for this view. They, however, hesitated with their approval. This was sufficient to encourage Bardas and Photius to seek to press on the recognition of the new patriarch in Rome by an embassy (859) which brought costly presents. But NICHOLAS only availed himself of this to vindicate the claims of Rome on the church property taken away by Leo the Isaurian, and the Roman rights of supervision over the ecclesiastical province of Illyria, and to protest against the uncanonical procedure in the removal of Ignatius and the elevation of a layman to the patriarchal throne. His legates at the assembly at **Constantinople** (May, 861). at which the rescript of the Pope was only made known in an incomplete and falsified form, did indeed consent to the deposition of the abused Ignatius. But this Nicholas repudiated, deposed his own legates at the Synod of Rome (863), and declared Photius to have forfeited the priestly office, and, in case he should further usurp it, to be excommunicated. Violent declarations on both sides followed. Bardas died in 866, falling a victim to the suspicion of the Emperor Michael. Nicholas addressed himself to the mother and wife of the Emperor and others who were favourable to Ignatius, as well as to the rest of the patriarchs and bishops in Asia and Africa.

Just at that time the Bulgarian Prince, BOGORIS, who had been converted to Christianity (his Christian name was Michael), disturbed by conflicting doctrines in the country and probably disposed to withdraw himself from the influence of Byzantium, had addressed himself to Rome and to Lewis the German with a request that they would send him Christian teachers (p. 146). Nicholas sent Roman bishops with the *Responsa ad consulta Bulgarorum*,¹ and he succeeded for the moment in chaining the young Bulgarian Church to Rome and drawing it away from the Greek Church, whose confirmation by priests he in accordance with the Roman system did not recognise. In Constantinople the place of Bardas had been taken by his murderer BASIL the Macedonian, who, as Master of the Horse and High-Chamberlain, had won the favour of Michael, and was raised to the co-regency and solemnly consecrated and crowned by Photius.²

The Bulgarian affair completed the breach. Incited by the procedure of Rome, PHOTIUS, in a circular letter to the Oriental patriarchs by which he invited them to a synod, ascribed to the Roman Church all the heresies of which it was accused by the Greeks. The most part refers to differences of **rite** and **ecclesiastical custom**, such as fasting on Saturday, the rejection of the marriage of presbyters once, the reservation of the chrism and other matters to the bishops. But the doctrine of the **procession of the Holy Spirit** from the Father and the Son, whereby two principles are introduced into the Trinity, is attributed to the Romans as sin against the Holy Spirit. The Emperor at the same time compelled the papal ambassadors, who were on the way, to turn about at the Bulgarian frontier without fulfilling their object. At a synod at Constantinople, in 867,³ at which it is said that Photius caused monks to appear as representatives of the patriarchs under Saracen rule and arbitrarily multiplied the subscriptions, Photius seems indeed to have played the impartial and only to have allowed himself to be moved by the synod to receive the complaints against the absent Nicholas; but the actual result was a verdict of deposition against Nicholas, which threatened all who held intercourse

¹ Mansi, XV. 401; cf. Hefele, IV. 346 sqq.

² After repudiating his wife, he married a left-off mistress of the Emperor and procured his own sister for the Emperor.

³ Its acts are not extant, as those which were sent to Rome were destroyed as being alleged to be falsified. Accounts exist almost entirely by opponents of Photius; on the side of Photius, METROPHANES episcopus Smyrnensis in Mansi, XVI. 418.

with him with excommunication. Photius sought to gain the Emperor Lewis II. by means of ambassadors and presents.

But BASILIUS MACEDO, whose favour with the drunken despot Michael was wavering, now put the Emperor to death, and himself obtained possession of the imperial power. He forthwith caused the fall of Photius, recalled Ignatius, and invited Pope Nicholas to confirm the reinstatement of Ignatius and to give judgment as to numerous clergy, who had been consecrated by Photius. But meanwhile Nicholas had died on the 23rd November, 867. His successor, HADRIAN II., at a Roman synod (869), in presence of the deputies of Ignatius, condemned Photius and his synod, and invited the Emperor to hold a great assembly at Constantinople, which should adhere to the Roman decisions. The Roman ambassadors were honourably received in Constantinople where the council met on the 5th October, 869.¹ All who had hitherto been adherents of Photius and clergy consecrated by him, were obliged, in order to find acceptance, to sign the *libellus satisfactionis* drawn up by Rome, the verbal tenor of which contained such important concessions to the ecclesiastical pretensions of Rome that the Greek feeling of independence was sensibly touched by it in spite of the dominant party passions, and the Emperor at the last was on the point of taking the completed document away again from the Roman legates. During the course of the synod, the at first very small number of bishops taking part, *i.e.* those who abandoned the cause of Photius, had gradually become greater and greater. Photius himself, placed before the Synod, kept a dignified silence, appealing to a higher judgment; the papal ambassadors, however, throughout occupied the standpoint that there was no question of investigating the matter anew, but of carrying out the judgment which pleased Nicholas himself, and in this they were supported by the representatives of the Oriental patriarchate. In the subscription of the acts the Emperor conceded the first place to the Roman legates and the representatives of the Oriental patriarchs, then subscribed himself before his patriarch Ignatius.

Meanwhile, however, a turn of events had arisen through the **Bulgarians**. The king Michael, irritated at Rome, which refused him the desired nomination of Bishop Formosus as Archbishop of Bulgaria, and perhaps also frightened by the success of Lewis the German

¹ The Latin translation of the acts by ANASTASIUS BIBLIOTHECARIUS, who who was then living in Constantinople, on the commission of Emperor Lewis II. The Greek text in Mansi, XVI. 307 sqq. As to their relation to each other, *vid.* GIESELER, II. 376 and HERGENRÖTHER, *Photius*, II. 160 sqq.

against Moravia, (p. 146), began to be again receptive to Greek influences, which were put forth both by the Emperor and Ignatius. Three days after the close of the synodal negotiations narrated, Bulgarian emissaries brought the request before the Emperor, that the assembly should decide on the question of which patriarchate the Bulgarian Church should stand under. Under the protest of the Roman legates, who appealed to the ancient ecclesiastical appurtenance of the region now possessed by the Bulgarians to Rome, the ecclesiastical activity of the Roman priests in Bulgaria and its voluntary adherence to Rome, the assembly declared in the Byzantine interest, that Bulgaria, which belonged to the Greek Empire, should be given back to the Church of Constantinople; the Romans, who had withdrawn from the Greek rule and attached themselves to the Franks, could no longer exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the Empire of the Greeks. As a matter of fact, Ignatius now sent a Greek archbishop and Greek priests and monks to Bulgaria, from which the Latin priests were expelled.

The deposed and exiled Photius now held his adherents closely together, and soon regained the favour of the Emperor. He was recalled, a reconciliation took place with the very aged Ignatius, and the Emperor exerted himself to obtain Rome's approval of the restoration of ecclesiastical peace by the restitution of expelled Photians. Ignatius also seems to have interceded for Photius in a missive to Rome.¹ As a matter of fact, after the death of Ignatius (23rd October, 877) Photius was again raised to the patriarchal throne. The Roman bishop, John VIII., allowed himself to be induced to consent to the restitution of Photius, but in doing so did not cease to demand in return the surrender of the Bulgarian Church to Rome. The political distresses of the Pope through the attacks of the Saracens on Italy and the local party-conflicts compelled him to pay regard to the Emperor's wish. To the synod which now (Nov. 879–March 880) met in Constantinople and which was to replace that held ten years before, the approving letters of the Pope were communicated in a Greek translation, which modified the lofty tone of the Pope into a request, set aside the satisfaction before the synod required of Photius, as well as the demand on account of Bulgaria, and on the other hand added the repudiation of the synod of 869. The question of Bulgaria was left to the decision of the Emperor. Finally, at first in a narrower circle in presence of the Emperor, then by the whole synod, a declaration of adhesion to the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Creed was issued,

¹ Mansi, XVI. 431.

solemnly repudiating every addition to it, which was therefore a declaration in the sense of the Greek rejection of the *filioque*.

John VIII. now in vain protested on account of non-observance of his prescriptions, and guarded himself against everything that his legates had done against their instructions. Whether John VIII. actually expressly condemned Photius, or avoided this out of regard to the Emperor, whose fleet the Saracens had just conquered, remains doubtful. In any case Marinus, as cardinal and emissary of John, had appeared so decidedly against Photius in Constantinople that he was kept in prison for a month by the Emperor. Then when Marinus succeeded John VIII. in the Papal See the quarrel continued.

But Photius did not long remain in possession of his patriarchal dignity; for after the death of Basil (29th August, 886) the latter's son Leo VI (the Philosopher) deposed him. Political charges made against Photius and Archbishop Theodore the Santabarene, who was closely associated with him, contributed to this; but the decisive point seems to have been the intention to transfer the patriarchal dignity to Stephen the brother of the Emperor, whom Basil had destined for the clerical career, and who had already become deacon and syncellos of the patriarch. The old complaints of Rome against Photius do not appear to have played any decisive part in the matter. But by the elevation of Stephen a special difficulty was created as regards Rome, seeing that Stephen had been consecrated by Photius himself, and was therefore not acknowledged by the opponents of Photius to be legally consecrated. From Photius himself Leo had obtained an actual written abdication.¹ For him, therefore, up to that point, Photius was the legal patriarch, whose ecclesiastical acts were not to be disputed; but for his opponents, and so for Rome, he had never been legal patriarch, hence the consecrations performed by him were invalid, and hence also the new patriarch Stephen was illegal. In the negotiations with Rome the Greeks demanded the remission of the ban against Photius, while the Emperor appealed to Photius's voluntary resignation. The Roman bishop, Stephen VI., censured the self-contradiction of this attitude.² The Greeks sought to evade the question of the validity of the consecrations, on which the right of the new patriarch rested, and only begged for dispensation for those clergy who were in ecclesiastical communion with Photius. The answer of the Roman bishop Formosus maintained the Roman standpoint, and so the question remained in suspense till, about 899, the advances of the Eastern Roman statesman Stylian obtained the abolition of the schism from Pope John IX.

In another affair the Emperor Leo VI. obtained the support of Rome against the opinion of his own Church.³ Although in a law issued by him (Novell. 90) he had declared against the legality of a third marriage, he himself proceeded to enter into a fourth marriage with a view to obtaining a legitimate heir. (Mysticus) NICHOLAS, the friend of his youth and intimate, hereupon condescended to baptize the child which his concubine Zoë had borne him, with all the ceremonial of a legitimate prince, in return for the promise of the Emperor to separate from Zoë altogether. But after a few days the Emperor brought

¹ *Vid. Vita Euthymii*, ed. de Boor, II. 22.

² Jaffé, Nr. 3452.

³ *Vid.* on this point, along with the letter of Nicholas (Nicolai Constant. epistola 32 in Mg. III.) and the so-called *Tomus unionis* under the Emperor Romanus, Mansi, XVIII. 333, especially *Vita Euthymii*, ed. de Boor, 1888.

Zoë back to the palace, had himself married by another cleric, and crowned Zoë who was now his wife. Nicholas resisted this alliance, which was contrary to the laws of the Greek Church, but on the pressure of the Emperor allowed an appeal to the Roman See and the three patriarchs of the East, and at a synod the Emperor actually obtained the desired dispensation.¹ But Nicholas resisted and was now compelled by the Emperor to lay down his office.²

Nicholas' place was filled by EUTHYMIUS, who was esteemed as a zealous monk, but who was deposed after the death of the Emperor Leo and exiled after severe maltreatment, in order to make room for Nicholas again. After the death of the Emperor Alexander, return to the patriarchal see was again offered to Euthymius; he however was finally reconciled to Nicholas. After his return, Nicholas had obliterated the name of the Roman bishop from the Diptychs, and his ecclesiastical commemoration was discontinued till, under the Emperor Romanus, the difference in the Greek Church was abolished by express recognition of the Greek principle of the rejection of a fourth marriage (920), and at the same time circumstances made an approach to Rome desirable for the patriarch Nicholas.³

The relations of the Greek Church to the West in the time of the Ottos are very various. The natural antipathies conditioned by history are now strengthened, now weakened by political interests.⁴ In this connection the superiority of Greek culture and learning is often enough acknowledged; cf. the disposition at the court of Otto II. and III., and the outstanding importance of Theophano. But the increasing variance is also nourished in many ways in the further course of the tenth century. With the Greeks the Roman Church came more and more under suspicion of heterodoxy, and as firstly the increased claims of the papacy under Nicholas and the ideas of the Pseudo-Isidore, so again the degraded condition of the Roman papacy in the times of the Pornocracy must have had a repellent effect. In the beginning of the following century the Constantinopolitan patriarch Sergius I. erased the name of the Roman Sergius IV. from the church books on account of the interpolation of the "*filioque*" in the Roman symbol (1009).

Only the political interests of the Emperor, however much they occasionally contributed on the one hand to the sharpening of the opposition, on the other hand nevertheless made it more difficult to come to a breach.

Thus the energetic Emperor Basil II. (976-1025), after successfully fighting the Saracens and conquering Bulgaria, sought to restore the Greek rule in Sicily and Lower Italy against the Arabs and the Normans who were now making their appearance, and with this object also exerted himself for the reconciliation of Constantinople with the Roman Pope. By the efforts of the Germans matters had gone so far, that in 1010 the whole of Apulia, which had received no help from the Greek Emperor against the Saracens, broke away

¹ *Vid.* the letter of Nicholas to Anastasius III. in Mansi, XVIII. 243.

² The secret and wavering procedure of Nicholas is explained by De Boor, basing on the *Vita Euthymii* edited by him, from the fact that Nicholas was not free from the suspicion of high-treasonable plans.

³ *Vid.* the letter to Pope John in Mansi, XVIII. 256.

⁴ *Vid.* the *legatio* of Liutprand under Otto I., Mg. III. (SrG. 1).

from Byzantium. Benedict VIII. procured the help of the **Normans** for the insurgents against the "heretical Greeks," who still ruled unjustifiably in Italy. The victory of the Greeks next forced Benedict to seek help from Henry II. of Germany. Basil II. now sought by means of considerable sums of money to induce Benedict's successor, John XIX. (1024-33), to recognise the Constantinopolitan patriarch as Œcumenical Patriarch of the East: "that the Church of Constantinople in its region (*in suo orbe*), like the Roman in the whole of Christendom, should be called Œcumenical." John was prepared for this, but the project, when it became known by rumour, was wrecked on universal opinion, especially that of Italy. Then when the Normans, who had been invested by Henry III. with the fief of Apulia, now also occupied Benevento which had been assigned to the Pope and held the Pope in honourable imprisonment, their common interest brought the Emperor CONSTANTIUS MONOMACHUS and Pope Leo IX. together. But just at that time the patriarch MICHAEL CÆRULARIUS of Constantinople, in ancient animosity to the Roman Church, had caused all churches with the Latin rite in Constantinople to be closed, and the Latin monks there to be deprived of their monasteries. In agreement with him the Bulgarian [metropolitan LEO of Achrida, in 1053, in a missive to Bishop John of Thrani in Apulia,¹ had asserted new reproaches against the Roman Church in addition to the old. The custom of using unleavened bread at the sacrament, which is demonstrable from the ninth century, was accounted to the Roman Church as Judaistic heresy, while, on the contrary, the eating of the blood (*suffocatum*) about which there were no scruples in the West, was designated heathenish. The omission of the Hallelujah during Lent was also censured.²

Leo IX. wrote a disclaimer to the Patriarch Cærularius, and set up Rome as the constant refuge of the pure faith, by which so many Greek heresies had been choked; no mortal had the right of judgment over the Bishop of Rome. He also appealed to the *Acta Sylvestri* and the *Donatio Constantini*. He also vindicated the large-heartedness of Rome, which quietly tolerated Greek monasteries and churches in their ancestral customs, seeing that as long as there was unity of the faith these did not imperil the salvation of souls.

¹ Which from the time of Leo the Isaurian had been detached from the Roman patriarchate, and stood under that of Constantinople.

² The letter, which was only known formerly in Humbert's Latin translation, was found by Hergenröther in a Munich codex, and first printed in Will, *Acta*, etc., pp. 56-60.

It is doubtful whether this missive was really despatched.¹ In any case the steps taken by the Emperor and also by the patriarch who was directed by him, who sought ecclesiastical peace, now intervened. Leo sent an embassy to Constantinople, at the head of which stood the masterful and passionate Cardinal HUMBERT. Leo's letters censured the assumption of Michael Cærularius, in calling himself the œcumenical patriarch, and desiring thereby to subordinate to himself the Eastern patriarchs; so also his procedure against the Roman custom in the Supper. Plainly under the pressure of the imperial wish, NICETAS PECTORATUS, a monk of the monastery of Studion, agreed to repudiate his treatise against the Latins in the presence of the court and the Roman ambassadors, and the Emperor caused it to be burned. But Michael Cærularius proved unapproachable and broke off all intercourse with the Roman legates. They then deposited a bull of excommunication against him on the altar of S. Sophia, on the 16th July, 1054, in which he was accused of all possible heresies, and every one who received the Supper from a Greek who blamed the Roman sacrifice was threatened with the ban. Once more the Emperor induced the already departed legates to return; but the populace took the side of their patriarch, the legates were obliged to take flight, and were placed under the ban by Michael at a synod, which the Oriental patriarchs also approved. The popular disposition, which was fostered by the Greek clergy, annulled the plans of the Emperor. Although the council represented the matter as though Humbert and his companions were not really legates of the Bishop of Rome, as a matter of fact the decisive and momentous schism was thus completed.

2. The Ecclesiastical State of Affairs.

1. To the arbitrary interference of the Emperor in the affairs of the Church, especially in the appointment to the patriarchal see of Constantinople and its ecclesiastical administration, there corresponds on the other hand an equally deep entanglement of the higher clergy, especially of the patriarch in Constantinople, in court cabals and political intrigues. This is attested by the circumstances depicted under Photius and Ignatius, under Stephen, Nicholas, and Euthymius. The emperors sought in many cases to place princes in the patriarchal chair, as Leo did his brother Stephen, and as in a specially striking way, ROMANUS LECAPENUS, who had completely possessed himself of power for the minor Constantine VII., placed his young son THEOPHYLACT. As, when the patriarchal see became vacant, the latter was still too young, a pious, otherwise uneducated

¹ The letters of Leo (Jaffé 4332 and 4333) in WILL., 85 and 89.

monk, TRYPHON, was obliged to fill the office temporarily, but, when he afterwards resisted, was sent back into the monastery. The Roman bishop, John XI., the brother of the Roman ALBERIC, allowed himself to be induced, in accordance with the wish of Romanus, to approve of this uncanonical appointment (933). Theophylact (933-956) afforded the example of a thoroughly unspiritual patriarch, whose dignity was only sought in **theatrical pomp of appearance**, while his ruling interest was in love of horses and the chase. On the other hand, Nicholas, who has been mentioned, especially afforded one of the examples of the meddling of the patriarchs in political affairs. After the death of the Emperor Alexander, the brother of Leo VI. (913), he stood at the head of the regency of the empire and then, when Constantine Ducas sought to gain possession of power, was skilful enough to secure decisive influence over the Empress-mother Zoë.

2. The development of the Byzantine emperorship into unlimited absolutism expressed itself in the fact, that Leo VI., in his **Novellæ**, abrogated the earlier laws on which rested the legislative power of the Senate which now only existed nominally. Corresponding to this is the fact, that, in the **ecclesiastical sphere**, he also claimed direct authority to issue ordinances on strictly ecclesiastical affairs even without a council. Only when many regulations were to be issued, was a synod in place (Novell. Const. 17).

He here lays down *e.g.*, that women after child-birth, if they are still unbaptized, are not to be baptized, or receive the sacrament, during the period of purification (40 days), but that the occurrence of sickness justifies exceptions. In legislation on those matters in which political and ecclesiastical interests concur, there is shown on the one hand a certain inclination towards regard to secular interests; on the other hand, however, there is evidence of how much the ecclesiastical points of view were also regarded as regulative for political legislation. Thus the existing Sunday legislation is made more strict by the prohibition of rural labour (*Nov.*, 54). Burials in the towns are permitted in ecclesiastical interests (*Nov.*, 53), to the state-recognised feasts and holidays there are added others in commemoration of the great teachers of the Church, Athanasius, Basil, the two Gregories and others (*Nov.*, 88), the ecclesiastical conclusion of marriage is made obligatory (*Nov.*, 89), entrance upon a third marriage is forbidden (*Nov.*, 90), although the royal legislator sought ecclesiastical dispensation for even a fourth marriage. On the other hand a certain testamentary capacity was ascribed to the monks (*Nov.*, 5), and the prohibition of the undertaking of guardianship by the clergy was limited to a certain extent (*Nov.*, 68). It is to be regarded as a certain indulgence towards the clergy, that the penalty for false witnessing is only to be taken in its full stringency from clergy when it is a question of testimony actually made on oath (*Nov.*, 76), that entrance into matrimony after ordination is only to involve a lowering of clerical rank, and that the earlier prohibition of certain secular occupations for the clergy is mitigated (*Nov.*, 86), and other provisions besides.

As regards **ecclesiastical and monastic property**, the Emperor Nicephorus had required its subjection to the land-tax, but Michael Rhangabe had already abolished this. Nicephorus II. Phocas (963-969), one of the most capable and successful rulers, who had been raised to the throne by the Empress Theophano, was, however, little liked by the clergy, because in spite of his strict piety, he heavily taxed the spiritual properties, and prohibited the multiplication of the so extremely numerous existing monasteries by new ones. On the other hand the important Basil II. had otherwise attempted to oppose the growth of the great "latifundias" in favour of small landowners, but in doing so he availed himself of the support of the clergy against a new aristocracy which was in process of formation, and so gave up the conflict of Nicephorus Phocas against the gathering up of pieces of land in the dead spiritual hand.

In this period, also, on the whole, alongside of much professional and strong spiritual extravagances¹ the most lively spiritual forces are still to be sought in **monasticism**. From it the higher clergy proceeded in many cases, while on the other hand also, numerous men of high rank, after an agitated political life, finally seek in it rest and religious peace. The monkhood wrought with zeal at the missions among and the Christianizing of the Slavs of Greece; churches and monasteries arose everywhere as the real mission-stations. In Crete, which was reconquered by Nicephorus Phocas, the monk Nicon distinguished himself by what was certainly a most highly turbulent activity in Christianizing. This period also sees the growth of the very important **monastery of Mount Athos**.

Numerous ascetics had long settled in the woods and gorges of Mount Athos. In the year 885 the demarcation of their settlements from the little city of Hierissos took place by imperial act. Leo VI., in 911, declared the independence of these monks from the older monastery of S. John Colobus, near Hierissos. Auranius, as monk named Athanasius, an ascetic from Trebizond, who was favoured by the Emperor Nicephorus Phocas, about 963 founded the famous abbey of Laura on the southern edge of the peninsula of Athos, and collected and organized the hermits anew. The rule which was established in 969, and confirmed by the Emperor Johannes Tzimiskes, contemplated the alliance of several monks' seats into one. The "*Protos*" of the different "*Hegoumenoi*," was to be dependent on the patriarch of the capital, who, moreover, had also to appoint the latter. The country town of Caryæ was to form

¹ A dramatic example of the mad extremes of ascetic self-neglect is afforded by the legend of S. Andrew the Fool by Nicephorus Presbyter Constantinop. (In the ASB. May, VI. 20, Mgr. III. 621), who like his predecessor S. Symeon, in the time of the Emperor Mauritius, played the madman for Christ's sake, and thereby exposed himself to every possible sort of insult.

the centre of administration for the ever increasing monastic settlements of Mount Athos. With the Greek monks there were soon associated Slavonic and further Iberian and Georgian, soon also Bulgarian and Russian monks. Under Constantine Monomachus (about 1016) their economical affairs were regulated by a second constitution (*τυπικόν*). At that time the strict exclusion of the female sex from the whole district of Athos was sanctioned. At that time 180 larger and smaller settlements were already enumerated. PISCHON in the *Historisches Taschenbuch*, 1860. W. GASS, *Zur Geschichte der Athosklöster*, Giessen 1865. V. LANGLOIS, *Le mont Athos*, Paris 1867. NEYRA, *L'Athos*, Paris 1881.

The **system of Divine Worship** developed in the manner determined by the victory of the tendency of opinion friendly to images, *i.e.* with a predominantly ritual character. At the same the **sermon** still retains importance.

The Emperor Leo VI. practically attested his literary and theological inclinations by the composition of nineteen orations for ecclesiastical feasts, which include the chief feasts of the Church, including the feasts of St. Mary (also the Ascension of Mary), the feasts of All Saints (the Sunday after Whitsunday), John the Baptist, S. Nicholas of Myra, and S. John Chrysostom. He also collected *preces liturgicæ* (*vid.* Mgr. 107). The treasury of the hymns and odes which were superabundantly made use of in the ecclesiastical cult is considerably further increased. The religious interest turns in increasing measure towards legendary matter (*vid.* the following section).

3. The Literary and Theological Development.

Literature: FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca græca* ed. Harless. K. KRUMBACHER, *G. d. byzantin. Literatur von Justinian bis zum ende des oström. Reichs*, Münch. 1890.

The embittered image-controversies, which extended over a century and a half, only contributed to confirm the religious spirit of the Greek Church in the tendency upon which it had already entered, without allowing an essentially different turn towards intellectual emancipation to emerge. In addition, the continuous conflicts of the Byzantine Empire with Saracens, Bulgarians and Russians put a check upon peaceful development; all the same, in this period—so great were the resources of the Byzantine Empire—a certain literary advance is not to be ignored. Merit is already attributed to CÆSAR BARDAS under Michael III., in the establishment and endowment of schools and the erection of an academy in Constantinople, which latter is to be noted as a free scientific establishment with a secular constitution. The academy, which was calculated for general culture, was presided over by the learned Leo, who after the victory of those favourable to images had been obliged to give up his archiepiscopal see of Thessalonica, but enjoyed the greatest esteem on account of his learning. Basil the Mace-

donian (867-886) and several members of the Macedonian dynasty, Basil's son Leo VI. the Philosopher (886-912) and his son Constantine VII. Porphyrogenitus (independent ruler only 945-959), made themselves scholarly names; Leo himself appeared as an author, and Constantine is especially celebrated on account of his promotion of the sciences (libraries and the educational system), however little he, like Leo, distinguished himself in his political rule. For the scientific turn of the age it is of special importance, that along with the treasures of patristic learning, interest was turned in an increased degree to classical literature. Alongside of the aspiring West, which was much poorer in scholarship and finer culture, but in the more vigorous life of its youth, and the quickly blossoming Arabic science, while original power is dying away, the Byzantines have still the somewhat hoary renown of **wealth of erudition.**

In the sixty-six short moral precepts of Basilius Macedo to his son and co-regent Leo,¹ the recommendation of literary culture stands significantly in the front, then follow the dogmatic and ecclesiastical requirements (orthodoxy and reverence towards the Church and priests, reflection on the future reward, alms in order to lengthen life and gather treasures for the other world, etc.). Leo VI. the Wise caused the new law-book, the βασιλικά διατάξεις, which had been begun under his father, to be completed by Sabbathius, in which the Greek translation of Justinian's legislation, commentaries of the Greek jurists, laws of the more recent emperors, and canons of the ecclesiastical assemblies and other matters are gathered together, and which now obtained official authority.² Leo's *Novellæ* have already been mentioned. Among his literary compositions a book on the Art of War stands alongside of an apologetic treatise addressed to the Caliph Omar on the truth of the Christian religion, homilies for ecclesiastical feast-days and liturgical prayers. CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, a weak ruler, allowed his state affairs to be much overshadowed by his favourite learned occupations, but has really certain merits as a promoter of scientific activity. He promoted the preparation of chronicles and encyclopedic collections, the gathering together of the most worthy to be known of older authors on various matters, animal medicine, agriculture, cattle-breeding, himself wrote the life of his grandfather Basilius Macedo, and on the military garrisons in the different parts of the Empire, and on the art of government. His book on the ceremonies of the court of Constantinople³ is especially noteworthy for the history of civilization. He also wrote on the Edessene image of Christ which was brought to Constantinople during his reign.⁴

¹ Κεφάλεια παρανετικά in Mgr. 107, 21 sqq.

² Edition by C. W. E. Heimbach, Leipzig 1833-50, 3 vols. and the *Supplementum* of Zacharia of Lingenthal, Leipzig 1846. Vol. vi. contains the *Prolegomena* and *Manuale*, 1870.

³ Ed. LEICH und REISKE, Leipzig 1751 and 1754, 2 vols. ed. Bonn 1829.

⁴ Edd. COMBEFISIUS in the *Fasciculus originum et antiquitatum Constant.*, Paris 1665.

The most important representative of the wide and varied learning of the age is PHOTIUS (*vid. sup.* p. 224). His book-learning is attested by his *βιβλιοθήκη* (also called *μυριοβιβλίον*),¹ in which under 280 numbers he gives an account in varied and accidental sequence of the works he has read by heathen and Christian authors (orators, historians, grammarians, lexicographers, physicians and theologians; but *belles lettres* are also represented, though strikingly few poets), mentions their contents, frequently also gives extracts and subjoins criticisms on their literary value, especially on style. It is a collection of inestimable literary value on account of its information and extracts from about eighty authors who have otherwise remained entirely unknown. The *νομοκάνων* of Photius contains in the first part the recognised missives of councils and synods, in the second the ecclesiastical state laws with the object of comparison with the former. (Cf. the earlier undertaking of Johannes Scholasticus in the sixth century.²)

A pure Greek, in the full sense of possession of the classical treasures as well as of patristic learning and orthodox dogmatics, he looks down with depreciation on the Roman Church, which was poorer in culture; he lays the main stress on correctness of orthodoxy and its dialectical development on the one hand, and on the Greek confessionism of the cult on the other. He practises the traditional Greek polemic in the four Books against the Manichees and in the treatise *De spiritus sancti mystagogia* (ed. Hergenröther, 1857), where the variant Roman doctrine is combated as heresy, with dialectical weapons. His letters (248 ed. Montacutius, London 1651) treat of numerous individual theological questions along with personal affairs; on him *vid.* especially HERGENRÖTHER, *Photius*, 3 vols., Regensburg 1867.

The appearance of persons such as the elder MICHAEL PSELLUS, who had the reputation of heathen sentiments and even in his later years had instruction on Christianity³ from Photius, made life in the learned traditions of the Greek sciences possible in spite of the dominant Byzantine spirit.

In scriptural exegesis the so-called *Catenæ* begin to prevail, also the Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, ascribed to ŒCUMENIUS, Bishop of Trikke in Thessaly (end of the tenth century), has essentially this character, although here in the utilization by extracts and turning to account of the patristic expositions, an independent judgment can still occasionally show itself. Alongside of it there goes also the favourite older form of the putting forward and replying to a number of individual problems of scrip-

¹ Edition of J. Bekker, 1824 sq.

² Edited in Voelli et Justilli *bibliotheca juris canonici*, tom ii.

³ *Vid.* LEO ALLATIUS *de Psellis*, in Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca* XI. 435 ed. Harl.

tural exposition, as in the *Amphilochia* of Photius, answers to 308 questions and doubts of Amphilochius of Cyzicus, which, for the rest, are not merely exegetical in substance; commentaries of Photius on the Psalms and Prophets, the Gospel of Matthew and the Epistles of Paul have been lost.

Quite special favour and influence in this age is now attained by the literature of the **legends of the saints** and **eulogies on the saints**, in which love of the miraculous and the play of rhetoric are combined; a branch of literature, in which, from the close of the image-controversies, there is exhibited a lively interchange between the Greek and the Roman Church.

METHODIUS from Syracuse, gained to the monastic life in Constantinople, afterwards as a supporter of images fled to Rome and was received as a friend by Leo III.; he was a man who stood in lively association with Theodorus Studita, and during this stay in Rome wrote a great martyrology; similarly other Greek monks, who fled to the West on account of the image-controversies, became bearers of this literature to the West. Later on the well-known ANASTASIUS, Abbot of S. Maria in Trastevere and finally papal librarian, wrought influentially till towards 882 by his numerous translations of Greek legends, as again, conversely, Western materials found their way into the Byzantine Church. *Vid.* USENER, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Legendensliteratur* in *JprTh.* XIII. 219 sqq. especially 240 sqq. In the great collection of SYMEON METAPHRASTES (Logotheta) this literature finds a compilation in the form of a collection of lives of saints arranged according to the months (Mgr. 114-116).

Symeon, who was himself venerated as a saint in the Greek Church, a man of rich and aristocratic family, stood in high favour with the Emperor Leo VI., and occupied the most important offices of the State, but afterwards retired into monastic quiet, and devoted himself entirely to that branch of literature. He may have died about the middle of the tenth century; *vid.* on him, whose life-time has been very variously determined, HIRSCH, *Byzantinische Studien*, p. 303. Much that is of later origin has insinuated itself into his great compilation.

4. The Sects hostile to the Church.

a. PAULICIANS AND THONDRAKIANS.¹

Sources: *Vid. sup.* p. 25 and JOHANNES PHILOS. OZNIENSIS *contra Paulicianos* in his opp. ed. J. B. Aucher, Vened. 1834; cf. WINDISCHMANN in ThQ. 1835, 25 sqq. ANNA COMNENA, *Alexias*, ed. Schopen, Bonn 1839. *Literature:* *vid.* p. 3 and DÖLLINGER, *Beiträge zur Sectengeschichte des M.A.*, I., München 1890.

1. From their fixed seats in Armenian Melitene (Argaum and Tephrica) the Paulicians continued their conflicts with the neighbouring Empire; after the death of KARBEAS, under his son-in-law CHRYSOCHERES, who extended his inroads as far as Nicæa and Nicomedia and in 867 plundered Ephesus, the Emperor BASILIUS MACEDO, for the purpose of redeeming captives, sent to Tephrica an embassy under PETRUS SICULUS, who bears witness to the fact that the Paulicians at that time were occupied with the zealous propagation of their doctrine, which already extended as far as the **Bulgarians**. After vain negotiations, the troops of Basil succeeded in beating an army of the Paulicians in Cappadocia in 872, and finally in destroying Tephrica. The political power of the Paulicians was thereby broken, but their sect survived, and about one hundred years later (969) the Patriarch Theodore of Antioch induced the Emperor JOHN TZIMISCES to transfer a portion of the Paulicians to **Thrace** (Philippopolis and its neighbourhood), where they served him as guardians of the frontier and were allowed to practise their religion unhindered. Here they took a new rise in prosperity, ruled almost independently in that district, spread themselves in Macedonia and Epirus, found adherence in Bulgaria also, but served stoutly in the imperial army. This relationship, however, was changed, when, in the conflict of the Byzantine Empire against the Normans (Robert Guiscard), they in part faithlessly deserted the Emperor ALEXIUS. Alexius gained the mastery over them and pardoned those who accepted baptism. He exerted himself through Archbishop EUSTATHIUS of Nicæa and the Bishop of Philippopolis to convert them, and as a matter of fact, after day-long disputations thousands of them allowed themselves to be won over (about 1116). The city of Alexiopolis or Neocastron, opposite Philippopolis on the other side of the river, was founded for the converted.

2. In **Armenia** proper the doctrine of the Paulicians acquired a somewhat different form in the tenth century through the Armenian SEMBAT. According to the Armenian patriarch or Catholicus

¹ For the sake of connection the chronological limit of the period is transgressed.

JOHANNES PHILOSOPHUS of Ozun, his predecessor Nerses III. Shinogh is said already to have had to do with Paulicians about 645. But the question concerns a related phenomenon of dualistic Gnostic stamp, a mixed formation, which appeared in Armenia as the sect of the **Arevurdi (children of the Sun)**. Gnostic Christian ideas were here combined with the ancient Armenian and Persian religious views. Paulician elements seem soon to have been added; and, in the end, opponents of images who were driven out from Albania by Christian bishops, attached themselves in a great settlement on the Lake of Cirga. This sect combated the Christian monks as idolaters, and rejected the veneration of the Cross. Under these influences, the above-mentioned SEMBAT, who had made himself acquainted with the doctrine of the Manichees and Paulicians, and had been introduced to magic and astrology by Medjasik, a Persian physician, now won the position of a reformer. Inasmuch as he gave himself out for a zealous Christian priest, he organized (between 833 and 845) at **Thondrake**, a country town south-west of the (upper) Euphrates, a community, the **Thondrakians**, to which the whole neighbourhood adhered. Their secret doctrine was only communicated to the initiated, but they knew how to accommodate themselves skilfully to the multitude in the propaganda which was zealously prosecuted by emissaries. Strictness of life, or the appearance of it, won on the one hand; the dualistic secret doctrines attracted the Manichees and Paulicians. John of Ozun accuses them of the rejection of all revelation and denial of immortality and the divine government of the world, and all sorts of secret abominations are said to have been practised in their assemblies. How much of these accusations is well founded cannot be known.

The **Thondrakians** had a whole series of other presidents after Sambat, and along with Thondrake other chief seats in High Armenia. Named Manichees by the people, they called themselves **Gascheziks**. In spite of repeated persecutions they spread in Armenia and Mesopotamia in the tenth century, and in 1002 an Armenian bishop, JACOBUS, passed over to them, who distinguished himself by a strict and abstinent life and seems to have given the sect a more Christian character. Here also, as among the other Paulicians, an **opposition to the ecclesiastical sacrament and the ecclesiastical worship** is noticeable. Prayers and devotions also, according to them, cannot avail for the forgiveness of sins. At the same time there also emerges here opposition to a custom which was usual in the Armenian Church, which appears as a national modification of the love-feasts of the ancient Church on occasion of the obsequies of the

dead. Here animals were also offered and slain as oblations for the benefit of the love-feasts, in which the poor received a share. Against this Jacobus proceeded ruthlessly. He was deposed and persecuted by the Armenian Catholicus SERGIUS, but escaped, complained on the subject in Constantinople, and then united himself to other Paulicians in Justinianopolis (*ob.* 1003). A little later their hostility to a highly revered cross in the neighbourhood of Mananalis gave an opportunity for persecuting the sect, who in their turn complained at the court of Constantinople of the burning to ashes of their dwellings. About the middle of the eleventh century the Byzantine Procurator GREGORIUS MAGISTER began a persecution against them in the Byzantine portion of Mesopotamia, in consequence of which numerous Thondrakians allowed themselves to be baptized. But alongside of the Paulicians who were transplanted by Johannes Tzimisces to Philippopolis, mention is also made of the adherents of the above Bishop Jacobus, the Thondrakians, as a related sect.¹

b. EUCHITES AND BOGOMILES.

Sources: MICHAEL PSELLUS, *περὶ ἐνέργειας δαιμόνων*, cur. Boissonade, Norimbergæ 1838, Mgr. 122, p. 819 sqq.—EUTHYMIUS ZYGADENUS, *narratio de Bogomilis* (Tit. 23 of his *Punoplia*) ed. Gieseler, Gott. 1841 and 52 (Mgr. 128), and ejdm. *Victoria de Messalianorum secta* in TOLLIVS, *Insignia itineris Italici*, 1696. —Anna Comnena *vid.* p. 237. *Literature*: p. 3 and JACOBI ZKG., IX. 507 sqq.; SCHNITZER *Stud. d. Geistl. Würtemb.*, II. 1.

In the beginning of the eleventh century the sect of the **Euchites** also appears in Thrace. Like the Paulicians, these Euchites or Enthusiasts are also designated by the general heretical name of Manichees, although they hold just as little specific Manichean doctrine. A certain dualistic fundamental characteristic suffices for this designation. In reality it is ancient Gnostic ideas, which here gain a new form. To the highest God, to whom the supra-mundane regions belong, they ascribe two sons; the elder, the ruler of the things within the world, who on the whole corresponds to the Gnostic Demiurge, and the younger to whom heavenly things are assigned, who corresponds to Christ. They are to render a certain reverence to both sons, as sons of the same father, who, though now at conflict with one another, shall at some future day find a certain reconciliation. Some of these Euchites are said to serve the younger son, as the better, who has chosen the better things of heaven, without however abusing the elder, because otherwise he has power to injure them; others again are said to glorify the elder, Satanael, as the firstborn and creator of the world. The latter ascribe envy to the

¹ Anna Comnena, *Alexius*, XIV. p. 452 (ed. Paris).

younger son and say that he sends earthquakes, hail and pestilence down out of envy ; indeed they are said to curse him and reject the Old Testament. In the latter expressions there is certainly some confusion of the narrators. Moreover all sorts of excesses in their worship, the murder and burning of children, drinking of blood and ashes for purposes of the cult, are ascribed to them. Both these doctrines and these darksome customs, with which they are reproached, point plainly back to ancient Syrian-Gnostic phenomena and suggest the hypothesis that in these Euchites we have really a reappearance of the ancient sects of ecstatic and heretical monasticism, the so-called Euchites or Messalians of the fourth century (*Vid. i.*, 362). If among them originally, only the doctrine that every man from birth was inhabited by a demon, who could not be overcome by the sacraments of the Church, but only by continual prayer could be perceived, yet Theodoret already knew that they suffered from Manicheism. There is therefore nothing improbable in the conjecture that this ecstatic monasticism, in order to support its practical dualism and its anti-ecclesiastical disposition, very soon admitted dualistic Gnostic elements. Seeing that the traces of these Euchites may be demonstrated through all the following centuries down to the time of Photius, and not only in Mesopotamia or Syria, but also in the districts of Asia Minor, we shall be justified in regarding the Euchites of the eleventh century as the descendants of that ancient sect, which early fell under Gnostic influences.¹

From these Euchites among the Slavonic population of Thrace, and this and the farther side of Hæmus, there proceeded the **Bogomiles**, so called since the beginning of the twelfth century by Euthymius, also called Phundaites, Euchites, Enthusiasts, Encratites and Marcianists. Euthymius mistakenly explains the name Bogomiles from their alleged cry, *Bog milui*, in the sense of Kyrie eleison (this would much rather be *Gospodi milui*). The name means friends of God or lovers of God. The sect made a stir in Constantinople in 1111, and the Emperor Alexius Comnenus cunningly elicited their secret doctrine from their leader, Basilus, a physician, which the latter confessed in spite of torture and death. He was finally burnt in the Hippodrome. Their doctrine appears to have been essentially what was only hinted at or defectively perceived in Michael Psellus.

¹ K. Müller (ThLZ. 1890, No. 4) is inclined to suppose an amalgamation of the Paulicians and the Euchites, on which the Euchites accepted the dualism of the Paulicians, but the latter placed themselves under the guidance of the Euchite ascetic class of the perfect.

According to Euthymius, they are said to have rejected the Mosaic writings, as also the God proclaimed in these writings, and to have regarded the men who were well-pleasing to him, and the other Old Testament Scriptures as inspired by Satan. However, they reckon the Psalter and the Major and Minor Prophets along with the Scriptures of the New Testament among their Holy Scriptures. The rejection of the Mosaic writings does not hinder them from utilizing the primæval history of Genesis in their own sense, only what is there depicted does not appear to them as the work of the highest God, but of his first-born and elder son, Satanael, the administrator of earthly things, who sat on the right hand of his father, but plotted a revolt and was thrown from heaven with the angels whom he had seduced. To him are assigned the creation of the world and men, but in order to give souls to men, he had to call in the help of his father, and promised him in return that they should have a common share in the creation of man. The place of the fallen angels could then be taken by men. But he circumvents the father by cheating Eve in the form of the serpent, in whom he had himself implanted life, and with her he begets Cain and his twin-sister Calomena. Adam, on the other hand, begets Abel with Eve, and him Cain slays. In this way Satanael seeks to withdraw the greater part of mankind from his father. But the father, when he discovers the cheat, deprives him of the divine form. Satanael, through Moses as the instrument deceived by him and the law given by him, brings innumerable men to ruin. The impure character of this law is shown by the fact that it partly allows and partly forbids marriage, eating of flesh, oaths, sacrifice of animals, and man-slaughter. In order to counteract the deceit which had been played upon him, the father in the year 5500 (according to the Constantinopolitan Era), causes the Logos to go forth as his son (he is like Michael, the angel of great counsel). He enters the Virgin Mary through her ear, and appears seemingly with a human body, in reality in a finer spiritual body, teaches the Gospel and overcomes Satanael, whom he now calls Satan, cutting off his divine name. But the suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus are only apparent. The Logos seats himself in Satanael's place at the right hand of God, but afterwards returns into the bosom of his father. The Logos, during his appearance on earth, would also have annihilated the fallen spirits and demons, but in accordance with his father's will they still retain the possession of this world during the present course of time. For this reason it is also advisable still to revere these governing demons. In the Gospel the son is reported to have said: "Honour the demons, not in order that they may use you, but that they may not harm you." In all men the demons are the real originators of crime (here we have still the real Eucharistic notion); they only flee from the Bogomiles, as at the shooting of an arrow. For the Holy Ghost begotten by the Logos dwells with them. The Bogomiles are the true θεοτόκοι. They do not really die, but are painlessly transformed, freed from their stained garment and clothed with the divine garment of Christ.

With the baptism of the Church as a mere water-baptism they contrast their rite of admission as the true baptism of the Spirit: confession of sins, and prayer lasting seven days, as well as obligation to secrecy, and even written promise never to return to the Catholic Church; thereupon the **Gospel of John** is laid upon them with invocation of the Holy Spirit and repetition of the Lord's Prayer. But there follows a second period of probation, and only then the

τελείωσις proper, at which the men and women present lay on their hands. The Lord's Supper is also rejected as a sacrifice of demons. The churches are said to be dwellings of the demons, the cross is abhorred, the worship of images designated mere idolatry, and the fathers who are honoured by the Church, especially Gregory Nazianzen, Basil and Chrysostom, are the false prophets against whom Jesus gave warning (this also without doubt an original Eucharistic trait). In truth, it was said, the fathers were under the guidance of demons, to whom also the miracles at the graves of the saints were ascribed. The Lord's Prayer is regarded as the exclusive prayer; every other is false lip-service. They reject marriage and the eating of flesh; three times a week they hold a strict fast. During persecution they hold fraud and dissimulation, and for that reason participation in Catholic worship and the sacraments, to be allowed. The priests of the Church are to them the Pharisees and Sadducees, against whom Christ strives; the learned are the scribes, whom Christ combated.¹

In the year 1140 excitement was caused by the fact, that Bogomilian errors were believed to have been discovered in the writings of the lately deceased CONSTANTINUS CHRYSOMALOS. The Patriarch LEO STYPIOTA, at a synod, brought about the condemnation of these writings, which, however, only contained certain heretical sympathies. The baptism of the Catholic Church was said to be powerless in itself, and required catechization, consecration (by anointing with oil and laying on of hands) and spiritual conversion, by means of which the second un sinful soul would be imparted. Everything performed by baptized, but still unconverted, persons, even attendance at church and offering of prayer and penance, remains vain. It is only by the laying on of hands that God's grace is received, according to the measure of faith and not of works. But the initiated are no longer subject to the law and can no longer sin. Only certain persons, as possessors of the Holy Spirit, could administer this mystery. Two Cappadocian bishops were deposed as Bogomiles in 1143 at a synod in Constantinople (Mansi, XXI. 583). In 1230 the Patriarch Germanus still complains that the Bogomiles steal about secretly into houses by night and lead away many by their appearance of piety.

¹ The fact that the Bogomiles combined with their doctrine a doctrine of the Trinity of a Sabellian character (Mansi, XXI. 551) is striking, but is hardly to be regarded, as it is by Euthymius, as a deception calculated for the simple.

THIRD PERIOD.

FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY (THE BEGINNING OF THE INFLUENCE OF HILDEBRAND) TILL THE DEATH OF BONIFACE VIII. IN 1303. THE FLOURISHING PERIOD OF THE PAPACY AND THE MÆDIEVAL ECCLESIASTICAL SYSTEM.

General Auxiliaries: A. POTTHAST, *Biblioth. hist. medii ævi*, Berol. 1862, and *Supplement*, 1868. OESTERLEY, *histor. geograph. Wörterbuch d. deutschen M.A.*, Gotha 1883. GÖTZINGER, *Reallexikon der deutschen Alterthümer*, 2nd ed. Leipz. 1884.

Introduction.

WE now pass into the period of the exaltation of the Church and the papacy to the highest pinnacle of power, and of the unfolding of the richest and most powerful life in the peculiar forms of mediæval civilization, which indeed frequently conceals the deepest conflicts. In the north of the German Empire, as especially in the north-east among Wends, Prussians and Livonians, the Church now plants its foot firmly by means of missions, especially those of the Cistercians and Premonstratensians, as well as by the knightly orders. Impelled by the power of the Christian idea, Christendom applies itself to the conflict with the Crescent, with a brilliant display but at the same time dissipation of its powers, and in such a way that the spiritual conflict leads involuntarily to a violent secular revolution in civilization. In the beginning of this period stands significantly the humiliation of HENRY IV. by the papacy conscious of its power, and the conflict of the feudal monarchy with this papacy in the **controversy on investiture**. The Hohenstaufens then bring in the flourishing period of the Empire, but provoke also the inevitable collision with the papal power and the resistance of the local powers to its universal tendencies. The heir of these universal claims, the young Frederick II., proceeds out of the guardianship of INNOCENT III., the pope who had led the papacy to the culmination of its power, and had known how to repress the threatening powers of heresy with the forcible weapons of the Church. Mediæval **science**, after its important rise in prosperity in the twelfth century, receives new fertilizing—but also decomposing—influences (Arabic-Jewish philosophy), and its most brilliant development in the great **Scholastics** of the thirteenth century. The powerful religio-ascetic impulse of **monasticism** creates, in the twelfth century, in new modifications of the older forms, the organs for the ecclesiastical and civilizing tasks of the Church (especially the Cistercians and Premonstratensians), and in the thirteenth century, according to new points of view, creates the new army of the Church, the **mendicant orders**. At the same time, the ideas of the Church find their artistic glorification in ecclesiastical architecture and its development into Gothic, and the bloom of national poetry appears, impregnated by the ecclesiastical spirit in Wolfram of Eschenbach.

But the dominant power now comes into most bitter conflict with the Empire; the embodiment of the ecclesiastical claims and ideals in Innocent III. is opposed by Frederick II., the representative of the secular and anti-ecclesiastical

tical civilization of the age now grown strong. The fall of the Hohenstaufens leaves the Empire in weakness, and when the Hapsburg puts an end to the emperor-less period, the monarchy in him abandons both its universal claims and its imperial rights of supremacy over the papacy. But now the hitherto suppressed dissolving forces begin to be astir. The **sects** loosen the firm hold of the Church on men's consciences, **scepticism** gnaws at the root of ecclesiastical science, **asceticism** comes into dissension with its mother, the hierarchical church. That power emerges, in which, at the close of the period, a new consciousness of the independent right of the State and nationality, represented by the monarchy, over against the papal absolutism is best vindicated: France, where the Capets at first occupied a difficult position over against the completely independent princes and the independent Norman power, but had gradually striven towards a closer combination, and, in spite of the conflict with the Anglo-Norman power from the time of Henry II. of Anjou, had partly attained it. Here in the thirteenth century SAINT LEWIS (IX. 1270), although permeated by the monastic and knightly ideals of the Church, helped the life of the State, as well as the national Church, to independent form, and at the end of the period, Philip IV. the Fair, no longer like the German Emperors in the name of a Christian world-rule, but in the name of a nation independently united in the crown, successfully confronted the world-ruling papacy. And in England, where since William the Conqueror (1066), under the Norman rulers, the secular and spiritual powers, the princely and ecclesiastical (papal) authorities come into strong contrast, the deepest humiliation of King John (1199-1216) under Pope Innocent, becomes at the same time the turning point of independent national development on the basis of the Magna Charta of 1215.

In **Southern Italy** the **Normans** had stood forth in opposition to the Arabs since the beginning of the tenth century, and had there founded the Norman rule, which was to interfere with such importance in papal and imperial politics and at the same time in the crusading movement (William of Apulia, 1040; Robert Guiscard, 1056).

On **Spanish** soil this period sees the gradual repression of the Crescent by the Cross. The on the whole tolerable relation of the subject Christian populace to their Ommeyyad rulers had been followed by a reaction in the ninth century, in the times of Abderrhaman II. (822-52) and his successor Mohammed (till 862), a period of fanatical zeal for martyrdom, which provoked bloody persecution (cf. Baudissin, *Eulogius und Alvar*). The brilliant times of the Ommeyyad Caliphate, especially in the tenth century under ABDERRHAMAN III. and HAKEM II. the contemporaries of Henry I. and Otto I., had seen a quickly blossoming Arabian science and civilization, which was also still carried on under the Hajej ALMANSUR (—1002) of victorious rule.

But meanwhile the Christian dominions in the north of Spain were consolidated. Out of Asturia, after the expansion under Alphonso II. and III. (the Great, —910) there arose under GARCÍAS the kingdom of **Leon**, and alongside of it come the counties of Castile, Barcelona, Navarre, etc., SANCHO III. the Great, of Navarre and the therewith united Castile (1003-35), arises in great power, while the Ommeyyad rule falls in pieces through the revolt of the procurators, and breaks up into Emirates. HESHAM III., the last Ommeyyad, dies in 1037. On the Christian side there now stand Sancho's sons, Garcias of Navarre and Aragon and Ferdinand I. of Castile, to which he united Leon. Although conflicts of the Christian dominions with one another were not lacking, the Spanish knighthood under Ferdinand I. and his son Alphonso IV.

(1109) rises to its best period in the continued conflict with the unbelievers. The city of Toledo falls before a great number of Christian knights from Castile, Navarre, Aragon, and Southern France. The deeds of the "Cid," the Castilian RODRIGO DIAZ († 1099) fall in these periods; in the Spanish conception he becomes the type of that knighthood, in which the spirit of knightly poetry and romantic desire for distinction in action makes alive again the legends of King Arthur, Charlemagne and Roland. And these knights also regard themselves as the heroes of the Christian faith. Against the **Almoravids** from Morocco (from 1086), called in to the help of the Moors, as again against the **Almohads** from Barbary, who took their place (from 1146), in the course of the twelfth century the Christian rule (ALPHONZO I. of Aragon, ALPHONZO VII. of Castile, ALPHONZO I. of Portugal) victoriously advances. After the battle of Tolosa (1212) till towards the middle of the thirteenth century there is completed the conquest of the whole of Andalusia. Only **Granada** still remains Moorish for several centuries. The disposition which here in Spain was fostered and increased, co-operated as an important factor towards the great movement of the **Crusades**, which took possession of the West.

The longing to go as pilgrims to the Holy Places never ceased in the Church from the time of Constantine and his mother Helena, and when the Holy Land fell under Mohammed's rule, the numerous Christian pilgrims were comparatively little molested by the Arabs. But already under the **Fatimite** dynasty (Cairo), from the beginning of the tenth century, and still more after the Seljuk Turks had founded their empire in Asia and, in 1073, had also made themselves masters of Syria, the oppression of the Christians of the Holy Land increased, as did that of the pilgrims who were attracted in ever increasing masses by the devout tendency of the age.

Under the leadership of Archbishop SIEGFRIED of Mayence, a host of, as is said, seven thousand men, among whom were many bishops, including the popular Bishop Gunther of Bamberg, appeared in full warlike array, marched to Palestine in 1064, but suffered great losses through hostile attacks. The Greek Empire had no thought of rescuing the Holy Land from the unbelievers, but in the Christian West such ideas had already for a long time become public. Sylvester II. had already (999) written a complaint in the name of the desolated Jerusalem; Gregory VII. summoned the young Henry IV. and the German people (in the year 1074) thereto, and promised to bring together an army of fifty thousand men and to place himself at its head. Ecclesiastical enthusiasm and knightly desire for distinction by feats of arms here combined with the desire of adventurous enterprise and often enough with the wish for release from oppressive conditions or obligations. On the other hand the internal circumstances in the Mohammedan empire could give some prospect of success; especially the opposition of the **Shiite Fatimites**, who in their palmy days extended their authority from Egypt as a centre far into Asia, to the **Sunnite** Caliphate of **Bagdad**. The caliphs of Bagdad, nominally recognised as head by the other group of the Mohammedan empires and governments, but sunk to the shadow of their power, fell into the hands of their first officers, the **Emirs al Omra** (the family of the **Buides**), who at the same time ruled independently in Persia.

The **Ghasnavids** now arose threateningly in the extreme East, and then the power of the **Seljuks**, and numerous conflicts and controversies over the throne broke out.—Victor III. summoned the Italian Christians in 1086 to fight against the Saracens in Africa, under the banner of Saint Peter. But finally **URBAN II.**, at the brilliant councils of **Piacenza** and **Clermont** in 1095, brought

to a head the agitation of men's minds. The Greek Emperor ALEXIS had begged in an embassy to the Pope for the help of the West in the conflict with the unbelievers. Urban threw the inspiration into men's minds.¹

1. The first hosts of unsupported and undisciplined thievish vagabonds under the leadership of Peter the Hermit and Walter the Penniless, which found destruction on the way in Hungary, Bulgaria, and on the soil of Asia Minor, were followed in 1096 by the flower of the Franco-Norman and Lotharingian knighthood under GODFREY of Bouillon, Duke of Lower Lorraine, RAYMOND, Count of Toulouse, ROBERT of Normandy (the son of the Conqueror William I., who in his disturbed circumstances grasped at the honourable undertaking), HUGO, brother of the King of France, Bishop ADEMAR of Puy, whom Urban himself decorated with the cross at Clermont and whom he sent out as his legate, besides the **Normans** under BOEMUND of Tarentum, the son of Guiscard, TANCRED and others. After the difficulties, of which the Emperor Alexius had prepared abundance for his threatening friends, had been overcome, the conquest of **Nicæa**, then that of Antioch (1095), finally the conquest of Jerusalem (15th July, 1099) indicate the success of the enterprise. Godfrey of Bouillon became King-Duke of Jerusalem. The new papal legate DALMBERT of Pisa as Patriarch of Jerusalem declared the kingdom a fief of the Church; Godfrey acquiesced, and sought to strengthen his rule by importing the feudal and knightly systems of the West. The kingdom comprised as its immediate possessions **Jerusalem, Joppa, Nazareth, Ramleh, Cæsarea**, and a few other points, and exercised feudal superiority over the four baronies of **Laodicea, Tiberias, Antioch, and Edessa**.

In the course of the next fifty years there followed gradual occupation of the whole coast from the frontier of Egypt to Ascalon (**Acre** or **Ptolemais**). The entire number of knights at the time of its highest prosperity can only be estimated at a few hundreds, the military at about five thousand.

Internal dissensions soon begin, increased by the excessively numerous clergy, at whose head stood the Patriarch and five archbishops; a mass of poor clergy and monastic folk, who stream together here to make their fortune. The "Franks" form the really favoured and ruling class of the population, and make themselves hated by their avarice, treachery and cruelty; so likewise their descendants born in Palestine, the so-called **Pullans**. In addition, there were the native Christians of the Greek rite, the real labouring and oppressed class (Surians), and a comparatively small number of Saracens and Greeks (Griffons). The chief supports of the Christian rule were the spiritual orders of knights (*vid. infra*).

2. About the middle of the twelfth century the conquest of Edessa by Emaeddin Zenkhi and his son Nureddin caused Pope Eugenius III. to call forth the **Second Crusade**, for which Bernard of Clairvaux staked his whole spiritual authority; King Lewis VII. of France obeyed the call, in Germany too the enthusiasm was now kindled (assembly of the Empire at Spire, Duke Frederick of Swabia) and carried along with it the Hohenstaufen CONRAD III. And yet the enterprise ended, after great distresses, with the fruitless siege of Damascus.

It was only the conflict of the different Muslim rulers with each other that still prolonged the life of the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem, till SALADIN, after overthrowing the Fatimites, united Egypt with anterior Asia, and now occupied Jerusalem on the 3rd October, 1187 (battle at Hittin or Tiberias).

3. Gregory VIII. then gave the summons for the **Third Crusade**: the Italians

¹ The alleged mission of Peter the Hermit, his message to the Pope, is a legend: *vid. Hagemeyer, Peter der Einsiedler*, Lpz. 1879.

equipped a fleet along with Danes, Normans, and Frisians. The Emperor FREDERICK I. marched in 1188 with 30,000 warriors, strictly kept in discipline, through Hungary to Constantinople, extorted the transport to Asia from the Emperor ISAAC COMNENUS, who was secretly negotiating with Saladin, conquered **Iconium** and came in good order to Tarsus. But his death in the waves of the Calycadnus (Seleph) near Seleucia (10th July, 1190) and many disasters loosened the bonds of discipline. Only a greatly weakened remnant under his second son, FREDERICK of Swabia, arrived before Acre. Here in the beginning of the following year PHILIP II. (AUGUSTUS), and somewhat later RICHARD CŒUR DE LION arrived by sea. At an enormous loss they finally won Acre. Duke Frederick of Swabia died of the plague. The quarrels of the Christian kings caused Philip's return to France, where he attempted to snatch the English possessions to himself; Richard finally obtained in knightly conflict with Saladin at least a three-year's armistice, which left the coast land in Christian hands and procured free access to Jerusalem for the pilgrims. In the following enterprises, secular, political, and commercial interests more and more take the place of the vanishing Christian enthusiasm.

4. Innocent III. caused an appeal for a new enterprise by the preaching of Fulk of Neuilly. A considerable force of French and Italian nobles came together, but in spite of the threats of the Pope allowed itself to be used by the aged Doge Dandolo, to conquer the important Zara in Dalmatia for Venice as payment for transport; they then involved themselves in the palace revolution in Constantinople and, instead of the conquest of the Holy Land, brought about the erection of the **Latin Empire in Constantinople** (1204-1261, first under Baldwin of Flanders, a creation of constant weakness).

The **Children's Crusade** of 1212, which was recruited from France and South-western Germany, only affords a contribution to the Christian pathology of the age. The enterprise carried out by King Andrew VI. of Hungary and Duke Leopold of Austria at the same time with Norwegians, Danes, and William of Holland, only led on the return to the conquest of **Damietta** (1219), which however was again lost as early as 1221 to Sultan KAMEL of Egypt.

5. In the enterprise, long delayed, but finally carried out in spite of the ban which was laid upon him, FREDERICK II., by the treaty with the Sultan Kamel, again made the Holy City accessible to Christians. But the Chowaresmians, who were crowded out by the rise of the Mongols, now interfered and conquered Jerusalem along with Egypt in 1247. This was the occasion

6. Of the enterprise of King LEWIS IX. the Saint (1248-54), who conquered Damietta, but fell into captivity. Finally came the march against Abu Abdallah of Tunis, which brought about the death of Lewis in 1270. Antioch fell in 1268; Acre in 1291.

The Crusades exercised the most deeply reaching consequences on the whole of mediæval life, and brought about the greatest revolutions in social and economic life, as also in the entire state of civilization. The aspiration of the spiritual power over the secular was powerfully promoted by this armed service of Christ in the Church, the knightly orders learned to apply their powers to the service of the Church, certainly also to serve themselves, and extend their wealth and dominion, in doing so. On the other hand the horizon is mightily extended; the contact of West and East, of Christian and Mohammedan civilization, promotes new ideas, which outgrow the Pope's authority; social relations are displaced, secular, especially commercial interests attain increased importance. Cf. WILKEN, *Gesch. der Kreuzzüge*, 7 vols. Leipzig 1807-32. B. KUGLER, *Gesch. der Kreuzzüge*, Berlin 1880. R. RÖHRICHT, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Kreuzzüge*, 2 vols. Berlin 1874-78.

CHAPTER FIRST.

The History of the Papacy and its relation to the Empire and the Secular Authorities in general.

Sources: J. M. Watterich (down to 1198), *vid.* I. 19 under 2 b. and II. 155. JAFFÉ, *Reg.* (down to 1198) and Potthast, *Reg. s. vid.* I. 19 under 2 b. JAFFÉ, *Codex UDALRICI Babenb.* in BrG. V. (*Mon. Bamb.*, p. 235) 1869. EWALD, *Collectio Britann. in NA.*, V. 275-414, 505-596. LOEWENFELD, *Epp. Pontiff. Roman. ineditæ*, Leipzig 1885. Pflugk-Hartung, *vid.* I. 19 under 2 b.—*Annales Romani* (1044-1183) in MGS. V., 468 sqq.

1. The Papacy and its reforming efforts under the influence of Hildebrand, —1073.

Sources: Mansi, XIX. Bonitho (Bonizo) *lib. ad amicum* (in Watterich and) in Jaffé, BrG. II. (*Monum. Gregoriana*) 1865. WIBERTI *vita Leonis IX.* in Watt.—DAMIANI opp. ed. Cajetanus, 1783 (Ml. 144). HUMBERTI *adv. Simonistas* in Martène ed. Dür. Thes. VE., 633 sqq. (Ml. 143). *Literature*: STEINDORF. *Heinrich III.*, 2nd vol., 1881, and GEROLD MAYER v. KNONAU, *Heinrich IV. und V.*, vol. i. 1890 (both in *Jbb. d. d. R.*).

ONCE more (Synod of Sutri, *vid.* p. 187) the interference of the German Emperor had rescued the papacy from being disgraced by unworthy persons. When more churchly and worthy men now ascended the Roman chair, the long prepared necessity for ecclesiastical reform asserted itself with more and more decision. The ecclesiastical feeling directed itself especially against the evil of **Simony** (the buying and selling of spiritual dignities for money), which extended so universally from the highest ecclesiastical positions down to the humbler offices of the Church, and which was closely associated with the whole secular power and state of property in the Church and its entanglement in the affairs of the feudal State. Alongside of this, great offence was especially caused by the dissoluteness of the clergy in regard to sexual matters, a consequence of the celibacy which was required from the canonical point of view; but it was just this priestly celibacy which cast the stain of an illegal alliance on the marriage of priests which was still prevalent in wide circles; it appeared as concubinage. The emancipation of the Church from the secular power, the dominion of the Pope over the whole Church, and the predominance of the papal power over the secular, were regarded as the curative means for the Church

which was bethinking itself of its spiritual task. Bishop WAZO of Liège, called into counsel by Henry III. after the death of Pope Clement II., had already required that the election of the Pope should necessarily take place *per ecclesiasticos ministros absque potentia sæculari*, an advice which at that time came too late, as Damasus (Poppo of Br.) had already been made Pope. Also after his death, which soon followed (twenty-four days after his entrance into Rome), the Romans applied to Emperor Henry III., who at Worms (in the end of 1048) with difficulty prevailed on Bishop BRUNO of Toul, his own relation, who had afforded his father Conrad and himself important services in Lorraine, but had also already decidedly entered upon the tendency of Cluniacensian reform, to assume the papacy. He made it a condition that he should once more be canonically elected by the clergy and people in Rome, and then went to Rome himself as a pilgrim. On the way the young monk HILDEBRAND (the intimate of the famous Abbot HUGO of Clugny) attached himself to him, and he ordained him a sub-deacon. As LEO IX., at the Easter Synod of Rome in 1049 he already set up alongside of the vindication of celibacy the requirement that not only should all *simoniaci* themselves forfeit their offices, but that all who had been consecrated by them (even though without simony) should be deprived of their posts, or at least should be consecrated anew. This radical measure, which, in the general diffusion of the evil, threatened the whole stability of the Church, he however withdrew on account of general resistance, and only required a forty days' penance of all who had consciously allowed themselves to be consecrated by a *simoniacus*. Subsequently he several times attempted to come back to the strict view, but without success.

On his frequent journeys in pursuit of ecclesiastical as well as political ends, through the whole of Italy, France, Germany and Hungary, Leo himself everywhere arranged synods, in order in this way to promote the centralisation of the Church in the papacy and at the same time to work upon the religious feeling and fancy of the populace by his personal appearance at ecclesiastical feasts, such as the consecration of churches, and the exaltation of the relics of martyrs. In doing so in Germany the Pope went hand in hand with the Emperor Henry. But when Leo, invited to the consecration of a church by the Archbishop of Rheims, at the same time convoked a Frankish synod thither, apprehensions were roused among the secular and ecclesiastical magnates of France as to such a direct magisterial procedure on the part of the Pope. They

induced the king to go out of the way and to call his prelates off to military service, so that only a few appeared in Rheims; but numerous abbots—impregnated with the ecclesiastical ideas of Clugny—nevertheless made the assembly a stately one; the prelates who remained absent were excommunicated, and here, as afterwards in **Mayence**, simony and the marriage of priests were seriously discussed, not less afterwards in Rome and Upper and Lower Italy. Along with great successes, this restless man, who, as we may say, first conquered the Papal See itself for this Cluniaic idea of reform, and introduced many elements friendly to reform into the Roman clergy, nevertheless in the course of his pontificate suffered many discomfitures, *e.g.* in his conflict with the **Normans** for the possession of Benevento, whither Leo himself marched with the army, and on its defeat was taken prisoner. But the victors threw themselves at his feet and were by him freed from the ban. Nevertheless he has not escaped the reproach on the part of strict friends of ecclesiastical reform, that for the sake of transitory possessions of the Church he grasped the secular sword. Leo also knitted more closely the alliance with the remnant of Christian Churches in North Africa. Under him begin those negotiations with Constantinople (*Cærularius*) which led to the breach. He died in 1054.

As plenipotentiary of the Roman clergy at the German court **HILDEBRAND** now effected the election of one of the most capable German bishops, Bishop **GEHARD** of Eichstadt, whom Henry unwillingly spared, and thereby gained for the Roman views a man who along with sound ecclesiastical sentiments had hitherto consciously opposed the papal interests in power: **VICTOR II.**—1057, who now worked through his legates in the same mind as his predecessor. So likewise did Abbot **Frederick** of Monte Casino as **STEPHEN IX.**, the brother of Godfrey of Lorraine, who was married to Beatrice, the widow of the Margrave of Tuscany. Before Stephen's death in 1058 Hildebrand had received from the Romans the sworn promise, in case of the decease of the Pope, to await his return before the election, but when the event occurred, the Roman nobility and the party which was hostile to reform carried out the immediate election of Bishop **John** of Veletri as **BENEDICT X.** Hildebrand, returning from the court of the Empress widow Adelheid, while in Florence, came to an understanding with his party, who had in part been obliged to take flight. With the approbation of the German Court, Archbishop **GERHARD** of Florence was elected and conducted to Rome by Duke Godfrey as **NICHOLAS II.** 1058–61. From now onwards Hildebrand as Archdeacon of the Roman Church stands at

the head of affairs. But for the whole situation of the papacy, the relation to the Normans in Southern Italy, which was fostered and well utilized by Hildebrand, affords one of the most important points of support. Richard was recognised by Rome as Prince of Capua, and took the oath to the Pope as protector and steward of the Roman Church. So likewise Robert Guiscard, as Lord of Apulia and Calabria, came into a feudal relation to the Pope, and the astute Abbot Desiderius of Monte Casino, Cardinal and Vicar of the Pope, here preserved the best understanding between Rome and the Normans, who in the Pope's interest broke down the castles of the Roman nobility.

In order to ensure the election of the Pope, Nicholas II., at the brilliant **Synod of Rome** in 1059, which however was but little attended by Germans, prepared new regulations, which place the decision in the choice of the Roman cardinal clergy.

Officium cardinale primarily means a fixed ecclesiastical office, *officium affixum et immotum in cardine suo*, and *cardinalis sacerdos* means a clergyman appointed permanently to one church, and ordained to its title, *incardinatus*=*intitulatus*, in contrast to commendators, vicars and assistant clergy. In a narrower sense in the tenth century the canonici of the **cathedrals** in contrast to the clergy of the parochial churches are so called. But in special application to **Rome** it indicates the permanent (entitled) clergy of the Roman churches, who all stand in connection with the papal Lateran church (as the proper cathedral-church of the bishop of Rome); thus the *presbyteri intitulati* of the various Roman parishes or titles and the *diaconi regionarii* are all cardinals of the Lateran church. But from the time of Stephen III. (IV.) (769) there are added to these the **seven suburbicary bishops** (of Ostia, Porto, Rufino, Frascati, Sabina, Palestrina and Albano), the so-called **Hebdomadarii**, who have to perform clerical functions each Sunday, according to their order of sequence, and so come into a relation of attachment to the papal church. To these (seven, afterwards six) cardinal bishops and a great number of Roman cardinal presbyters and cardinal deacons the name of cardinal is now applied pre-eminently, and hence re-interpreted, as by Leo IX.: *clerici summæ sedis Cardinales dicuntur, cardini illi, quo cetera moventur, vicinius adherentes*. (The number remained changeable till Sixtus V. in 1586 fixed it at six bishops, fifty presbyters, and fourteen deacons.)

The canonical basis for the papal election was formed by the regular ancient election of a bishop by the clergy and the community with the co-operation of the neighbouring bishops. Concurrent interests in the case of a post which was also so important politically, early led to interferences of the secular power, for which a handle was specially afforded by the decision in the case of a discordant election. (The last West-Roman Emperor, Theodoric, although the Synodus Palmaris had proclaimed freedom from secular rule.) After the removal of the Ostrogothic rule the Greek Emperors laid claim to a right, which was exercised through their Exarchs, of a certain supervision over the act of election and a right of confirmation, only after which the consecration of the elected was to take place. But the election itself was by the clergy and—representing the community—the different categories of the influential Roman

populace. The election, which in the time of the decay of the Lombard rule often ensued without regard to a secular lord, was so much the more subject to the local party conflicts, and this in 769 (Stephen III.) led to the regulation that (1) the election should only be made from the number of the Roman cardinal clergy (deacons and priests)—which was often not maintained, and was abolished by Nicholas II.—and (2) that only the clergy were to exercise the actual right of election, while the laity have merely the right of acclamation and joining in the signature of the minute of election. Under the Frankish supremacy the imperial confirmation was required, in so far as the consecration was only to ensue after the individual elected had taken the oath to the royal emissaries; to this the Romans had to bind themselves expressly in 824. After the fall of the Carolingian rule this partly ceased or was exercised according to circumstances; as again John IX., elected under the influence of the Emperor Lambert, ordained at the synod of 898, that the Pope should be elected by the cardinal bishops and the entire Roman clergy in the presence of the senate and people, but that he might only be consecrated in the presence of the imperial ambassadors. Otto I., after rescuing the papacy from the slavery of the Italian parties, next confirmed the imperial right of influencing the papal election, or rather of confirming it. To this the Ottos firmly adhered, and after the renewed outbreak of these parties, Henry came forward with the same right and exercised it repeatedly. Now, however, the papacy, which was invigorated anew and supported in its efforts after reform by the Emperor, had to be secured not only against the party interests of the nobles and the storms of a popular election, but also against the deciding influence of imperial power. Appealing to the ordinance of Stephen III. (IV.) of 769, in the decree of Nicholas II. the **main weight in the actual act of election is exclusively placed in the college of cardinals**, and indeed among them pre-eminently in the hands of the cardinal bishops. The Pope is indeed as a rule to be taken from the **Roman Church**, but if no suitable person can be found here, he may also be taken from outside (for the higher interests of the Church must not be too much limited in this respect). If no impartial choice be possible in Rome, the election is to take place at another place by the cardinal bishops, clergy and, even though only a few, Catholic laymen; and a Pope, so elected abroad, even before he has been enthroned in Rome, is to have the full legal power of exercising his functions. Under these regulations the honour due to King Henry, the expectant Emperor, is to be reserved, as has already been conceded him by the Pope, and to his successors, who in the future shall personally obtain this right from the Apostolic See. With this general and undefined turn of expression, which treats a participation in the election not as a self-evident right of the Emperor's, but as a contingent personal concession, the right of the Emperor to take part in the election of the Pope, is turned into the *one* and, according to SCHEFFER-BOICHOEST'S demonstrations, genuine papal conception of the decree, while certainly the other (and imperial) (1) wipes out the marked preference of the cardinal bishops over the other cardinals—which nevertheless did not permanently maintain itself—and (2) puts in the foreground the reference to the Emperor, even though in the same indefinite manner and conceived as a personal concession. Cf. ZÜPFELL, *Die Papstwahlen*, Göttingen 1874; SCHEFFER-BOICHOEST, *Die Neuordnung der Papstwahl durch Nicolaus II.*, Strassb. 1879.

At the above Roman Easter-Synod (at which the affair of Berengar was also discussed) or at one somewhat later, decided measures were also taken against **simony** and the **marriage of priests**.

The defenders of the latter were branded with the ancient heretical name of Nicolaitanes; all priests with wives were forbidden on pain of the ban to hold mass and divine worship, and deprived of the enjoyment of ecclesiastical revenues. The party of reform now sought also to gain the support of popular opinion. Cardinal DAMIANI and others in their sermons invited their hearers to attend no divine service by such clergy. In Florence a monkish party denied the clergy in general who were stained with simony and concubinage, the capacity of administering the sacraments with saving efficacy so that many of the laity died without communion. On the other hand opinions became public, which regarded the formal recognition of the marriage of priests as the only decisive means of cure. Archbishop CUNIBERT of Turin, himself unmarried, allowed his clergy to marry, and even DAMIANI, who combated this, was obliged to acknowledge that they distinguished themselves by their conduct of life and knowledge. In the diocese of Milan also the marriage of priests was quite universal, and the clergy indeed, free neither from simony nor secularity (secular businesses and pleasures such as hunting), but yet, on the whole, they stood high. But it was just here that there now emerged an ecclesiastical demagogic movement, promoted and favoured by the powerful efforts towards reform of Anselm da Baggio (afterwards Bishop of Lucca and finally Pope Alexander II.), the so-called **Pataria**,¹ which simultaneously directed itself against the secular clergy and the nobility of the cities. Fiery preachers of repentance, like ARIALD already for a long time, and then LANDULF, rebuke the secularised clergy and contrast with theirs the poor and chaste life of Christ. The violence of the party conflicts caused Nicholas II. to send Cardinal Damiani and Anselm of Lucca to Milan. The ancient independence of the metropolis bristled up against the interference of Damiani, but Archbishop WIDO submitted to the Pope, and thus by taking advantage of the ecclesiastico-political fermentation the demands for the reform of the Church and the ecclesiastical claims of Rome over Milan were simultaneously carried to a successful issue. But in **Germany** the bold efforts of Nicholas, which also worked against the German imperial influence on the papal election and on Italian affairs, already awakened a strong opposition. Cardinal Stephen, who was to transmit the acts of the Roman council, was not admitted to audience at all by the German court, and a German assembly, in which bishops also took part, subsequently declared all statutes of

¹ The name *Patarini* is derived from the quarter of the rag-gatherers, *Pataria*.

the Pope to be invalid. After the death of Nicholas II. ANSELM of Lucca, raised by Hildebrand and the cardinals without any reference to the German king Henry IV., ascended the papal throne as ALEXANDER II. (1061-73). The opponents of Hildebrand (the Roman nobility) attached themselves to the German court, which was already excited and disturbed by the close alliance of the Roman See with the Normans. At the **Council** at **Bale** the imperial party declared the young King HENRY IV. to be the heir of the Roman Patriciate and, appealing to the rights exercised by Henry III., declared Anselm an intruder, and in agreement with the Lombard bishops, set up Bishop CADALO of Parma, a representative of the higher Lombard clergy as anti-pope: HONORIUS II., an election in which no cardinal took part. Lombard troops conducted him to Rome, he took possession of the Leonine city, as Godfrey of Lorraine could not come forward directly against the imperial Pope, and the Normans were occupied in Southern Italy; and the Roman nobility took his side. Godfrey sought to mediate and Cadalo was able to withdraw and await a German decision. But in Germany the revolution was completed by the overthrow by the German princes, under Anno of Cologne's leadership, of the imperial rule of the Empress Adelheid and by Anno himself obtaining possession of the person of the infant king and the government of the Empire (1062). The Synod of **Osbor** (Augsburg) declared in favour of Alexander II.; royal ambassadors were to conduct him to Rome, if their examination should show that Alexander II. had been elected without simony. In this way the ecclesiastical principle of reform was practically victorious, although the decision still formally lay in the hands of the German court.

But the young King Henry now fell out of the hard hand of Anno into that of the ambitious Archbishop ADALBERT of Bremen, who (1065) carried through the declaration of his capability of bearing arms, and gave free scope to his passions. After Adalbert's influence was broken, the princes of the Empire forced a wife (Bertha) on Henry, from whom he sought separation with the help of the bishops who were about him (Siegfried of Mayence and others), but Alexander II. decidedly rejected this through his legate DAMIANI at the Diet of **Worms** (1069). Henry, filled with deep mistrust of the great princes of the Empire, had surrounded himself with younger men distinguished neither by birth nor property, the companions of his youthful pleasures, who along with the bishops about the King formed a sort of court government. At this court the trade in clerical offices and the bestowal of ecclesiastical

and monastic property on laymen and also on prelates was vigorously pursued. In this regard the avarice of Adalbert of Bremen is notorious. ALEXANDER II. at the **Easter Synod** of 1070 now ordered the Archbishops of Mayence and Cologne and the Bishop of Bamberg to Rome, to justify themselves against the reproach of simony. It was thus meant to make them docile instruments of the Pope, which also succeeded. But the state of affairs in Lombardy gave occasion for the taking of further measures. In **Milan** the movements of the Pataria had progressed under the clerical demagoguery of ERLEMBALD. After he had laid down his office (1060), the reforming party raised a cleric named Atto, who however was forced to abdicate by the enraged burghers. On the other hand, King Henry, whose power in Lombardy for the most part rested on his right of investiture of the bishops, caused Bishop GODFREY, whom he had previously invested on WIDO's proposal, but who was already the object of the papal ban, to be consecrated at Novara by the assembled bishops. Alexander II. now laid the ban upon several advisers of the King, at the same time reproaching them with simony, but died soon after.

2. The Pontificate of Gregory VII.

Sources: JAFFÉ, BrG. II. (*Mon. Greg.*) vid. p. 248. The letters also in ML. 148, where also col. 843 sqq. the *Vetera monum. contra schismaticos* collected by GRETSEK ed. TERGNAGEL, Wien 1611 (also in GRETSEK's Opp. VI.) have been printed, contrasted with which is MICH. GOLDAST's *Apologie pro Imp. Henr. IV.*, Hanov. 1611. On the controversial literature vid. MENZEL, *die fränk. Kaiser*, II. 55; CASSANDER, *das Zeitalter Hildebrands für und gegen ihn*, Darmst. 1842; HELFENSTEIN, *Greg. Bestrebungen nach den Streitschriften s. Z.*, Frank. 1856 and K. MIRET, *die Absetzung Heinrichs IV.*, etc. in *Kg. Studien, Reuter gewidmet*, 1887, p. 95 sqq. and WATTE. under the names Beno, Benzo, Olbert, WALRAM of Naumb.; PAULUS BERNRIEDENS, Herrand, BONIZO, Bruno *de bello Saxon.*, BERNOLD of Const. — *Literature*: J. VOIGT, *Hildebrand als Gregor VII. u. s. Z.*, 2nd ed. 1846; LIPSIUS in *ZhTh.* 1859; A. F. GFRÖRER, *Gregor VII. u. s. Z.*, 7 vols., Schaff. 1859-61 (the portrait of Gr. VII. is almost lost in a comprehensively sifting universal church history of his time).—H. FLOTHO, *K. Heinrich IV.*, 2nd ed. 2 vols., 1855; W. GIESEBRECHT, *die Gesetzgebung der röm. Kaiser zur Zeit Gregors* in the *Münchener hist. Jb.* 1866; v. RANKE, *WG.* vol. 7, 1887 and thereon W. MARTENS, *Heinrich IV. u. Gr. VII. nach der Schilderung v. Rankes*, 1888.

At the funeral obsequies for Alexander II. HILDEBRAND was himself elected by the acclamation of the people, which Cardinal Hugo was skilful enough to turn in such a way that the election nevertheless appeared to proceed from the cardinals. Henry did not feel himself in a position to raise objection to the choice. Hildebrand was now to carry to completion as Gregory VII. what he had intro-

duced by his influence since the election of Leo IX. He deeply felt the corrupt condition of the Church, and descried a main root of the evil in the fact that the secular lords did not hesitate to degrade the Church to the position of a handservant, and in her emancipation and exaltation to decisive power he saw the task under the enormous burden of which he almost succumbed. The Church was to rule as the divine authority not merely in the guidance of men's consciences, but also in the whole of political life. He already emphasizes most sharply the profane and heathen origin of the secular power in contrast to the divine origin of the spiritual, and so brings to its strongest expression that dualism between the spiritual and the secular which dominates the whole of the Middle Ages, till the reaction against it asserts itself ever more sharply in the last period of the Middle Ages, and finally the Reformation **brings the religious recognition of the moral significance of the state and every other natural ordinance of God.**

Hence there proceeded a war for life or death between Church and State with so much the more necessity that the hierarchy, with its claims to power and property, had itself entirely assumed the character of a secular power, and had utilized the divine dignities it claimed to obtain enormous secular privileges, and thereby indeed had undermined its really spiritual aims. But the dominance of the papal power required their **concentration** in the papacy. Thus all the previous claims of the papacy seemed to gain exalted life in the powerful personality of Gregory VII. As he interfered despotically in the organism of the Church, so also he claimed to exercise authority over the throne, and besides, he occasionally came forward with the most extravagant claims on various Western kingdoms as special fiefs of S. Peter.

At first Gregory appeared to desire to direct his weapons against King Philip of France, "the worst of the tyrants who enslaved the Church." He was able to count upon the powerful support of the Cluniacs, but much less upon that of the French bishops, whom as early as 1074 he accuses of a share in the guilt of the simony practised by the King. He required them to withdraw their obedience from the latter, and if not, threatened France with the interdict. But with a more correct estimate of the circumstances of Germany and the dangers which threatened from Lombardy, he let this conflict drop and turned against Henry IV. The latter had so alienated Saxony and Thuringia by harsh proceedings, that they desired to accuse him to the Pope of oppression and simony. Gregory immediately demanded the dismissal of the councillors who had been

excommunicated by his predecessor. His mother, who was devoted to the Pope, sought to mediate, and the Saxon revolt which now broke out (still in 1073) still further induced him to give way. He wrote a submissive letter to the Pope,¹ rendered a repentant confession at Nuremberg in 1074 in the presence of his mother and two Roman cardinals, and, along with the excommunicated councillors, who had promised on oath to surrender all church properties obtained by simony, was received into the communion of the Church. The attempt of the cardinals to bring about at this point a German national council in order to carry out the reforms required by the Pope, was wrecked on the antipathy of the German clergy. But at that time the Pope was able to hope that he would be able to induce Henry as an obedient son of the Church to a war against the infidels. The wish of the Pope to come to the help of the Greek Emperor Michael VII., who was oppressed by the Seljuks, was at the same time induced by the hope of abolishing the still recent schism between the Roman and the Greek Churches. But about the same time Gregory himself was hard pressed by the Normans, and Henry, after overthrowing his enemies, soon returned to his old manner, and the German clergy resisted the interference of the Pope. At the Roman Synod (February, 1075) Gregory then decreed numerous ecclesiastical penalties against resistant German and Lombard bishops, and five councillors of the King were once more laid under the ban on account of simony. But in addition, at a Roman synod of the same year, he carried through the bold **law of investiture**, which prohibited bishops and abbots from receiving a bishopric or abbacy from the hands of a layman, and prohibited the rulers from conferring investiture on penalty of excommunication. Before the publication of the law Gregory caused confidential overtures to be made to the King, in order, as it seems, to give the King an opportunity of taking measures to obviate the threatening dangers which were involved in this extreme step. At the same time he himself was threatened and entangled on all hands; ROBERT GUISCARD, whom he had previously excommunicated, he once more laid under the ban. But in Milan the fall of ERLEMBALD and the Pataria ensued at Easter 1075; the Milanese craved an archbishop from the Emperor; the majority of the Lombard bishops, under the leadership of WIBERT of Ravenna, again resisted Gregory; and in Rome itself—even among the clergy—the opposition was active; Cardinal Hugo the Wise took the lead among his opponents.

¹ Greg. Reg. I., 29 a. Ed. JAFFÉ, p. 46.

Henry, who in the summer of 1075 still negotiated¹ directly with the Pope through ambassadors, after completely overthrowing the Saxons now ceased to pay any attention. The excommunicated persons appeared in his *entourage*, and in Lombardy, at the sitting of the diet on the **Plain of Roncaglia**, he praised the Milanese, declared the Pataria enemies of the Empire and the King, and by his own appointment gave the Milanese an archbishop (Thedald). Once more Gregory applied to Henry through representations by letter and oral charges through the returning royal ambassadors, and threatened him with the ban, at the same time making use of the moral accusations which had been raised against him. Henry received the embassy in Goslar on the 1st January, 1076, where he held a diet under a full sense of his restored power, and now destroyed his bridges. At **Worms** (24th January, 1076) he caused a great portion of the German bishops to declare the deposition of the Pope who, as was said, was shattering the Empire and degrading the bishops.² The Lombard bishops subscribed the decree of deposition at Piacenza and Pavia. Its bearers aroused a fearful storm against themselves at the Lenten Synod of Rome (1076), and Gregory now declared the excommunication and deposition of Henry, and released his subjects from their oath. Serious voices did indeed deny the Pope's right to the latter course;³ but a portion of the German bishops at once humbled themselves before the Pope, others began to waver, and the German princes, angered over Henry's government, demanded at Tribur in October, 1076, that the King should give satisfaction to the Pope, and the Pope hold judgment on Henry in Germany itself; if by his own fault Henry should remain under the ban for a year's time, another King was to be elected. Henry then resolved to make his peace with the Pope in order to take their weapon out of the hands of the German princes. Before the Pope came to Germany, he hastened in the winter with his wife and child from Besançon, over Mont Cenis, and found a friendly reception in Lombardy, so that the Pope, already on the way to Germany, betook himself to the castle of **Canossa** to the Margravine Matilda of Tuscany, fearing an evil turn of affairs from Henry and the Lombards who were hostile to the Pope. But Henry was driven by his threatened position in Germany to seek release from the ban above everything. This brought him as a **penitent** into the court-yard of **Canossa** (January, 1077), where

¹ *Vid.* Henry's letter inserted in the Reg. IV. 5.

² The decree of deposition of Worms, *vid.* MGL. II. 46.

³ Segebertus Gembl., Theodore of Verdun and Walram of Naumburg.

Gregory saw him stand from morning till evening during three days before he released him from the ban at the intercession of Matilda. Henry was obliged to promise to render satisfaction to the German princes according to the judgment of the Pope, and to afford the latter or his legates security for his journey to Germany with a view to adjusting the quarrel.¹ Henry's humiliation—that event of typical significance—was however neither a reconciliation nor any brilliant victory for Gregory. But Henry thereby alienated the Lombards, who regarded themselves as deceived in him, but were brought together with him again by the similarity of their interests: his attitude showed that he only awaited more favourable times to move against the Pope once more. The German princes on the other hand, very little contented with the release of the ban, so as not to be given over into his hand, now proceeded at **Forcheim** in March, 1077, and in the presence of a papal legate, to the election as king of **RUDOLF** of Swabia, who was obliged to promise free episcopal election and non-exercise of the right of investiture! While the civil war now raged in Germany, the Pope, although through his legates he had done everything to ruin Henry, shrewdly withheld his decision until Rudolf overcame Henry at Flarchheim (1080); only then did Gregory renew the ban against Henry at the synod in Rome, declare for Rudolf, and issue the general prohibition of lay investiture. Henry, however, at Mayence and Brixen caused Gregory's deposition to be declared, and in Brixen Archbishop **WIBERT** of Ravenna was elected as **CLEMENT III.** In the autumn of 1080 Rudolf fell in the battle on the Elster, whereby the adherents of Henry were not a little increased. But the embitterment had reached too high a point for Gregory to be able to try to turn back. He was now reconciled to the Norman Robert Guiscard, whom he had excommunicated in 1074 on account of his seizing possession of Campania, and bestowed upon him the fief of Lower Italy; in Germany he stirred up the project of a new election of a King pleasing to Rome (in doing which his legates were to be prepared in case of need to give up many of the hierarchical demands). In March, 1081, Henry marched into Italy, desolated the lands of Matilda, and advanced on Rome and conquered the fortified Leonine City (2nd June, 1083). After vain negotiations, Henry conducted his pope, Clement III., to Rome, and he was now solemnly consecrated and recognised, and at Easter, 1084, crowned Henry and his spouse. Gregory, who was besieged in the Castle of

¹ Lambert's statements go further.

S. Angelo, was conducted by Robert Guiscard and his Normans, before whom the Emperor withdrew, after a frightful pillage and laying in ashes of Rome, to Salerno, where he once more summoned believers to his aid, but in vain. Near his end, he excepted Henry and Clement III. from the absolution which he granted to his opponents, and died on the 25th May, 1085 with the words: "I have loved righteousness and hated injustice, therefore I die in exile."

Gregory proceeded quite differently against William of Normandy the conqueror of England, for whom Lanfranc, the Prior of the monastery of Bec, afterwards Abbot of the monastery of S. Stephen in Caen, had procured a dispensation from Pope Nicholas II. (1059) on account of his marriage, which was ecclesiastically disputable. At that time Hildebrand expected much of William and looked with favour on his conquest of Anglo-Saxon England. William came forward with the claim to be the reformer of the English Church, which was in process of decay, and Lanfranc became his adviser in so doing. Hildebrand hoped by ecclesiastical authorization of William's enterprise to obtain for the Church a position of feudal superiority over the new kingdom, and William stood in need of the Pope as against the Saxon clergy. Hence in 1070 a papal embassy came to England; William was crowned anew, and by means of the Synod of **Winchester** and the replacing of many Saxon bishops by Normans carried through the reform of the English Church after the French model, just as in the secular sphere he carried out the Norman-French feudal constitution. Lanfranc, raised to the archbishopric of Canterbury, obtained the subordination of the archbishopric of York to Canterbury in the interest of political as well as ecclesiastical unity. But William laid claim to the right of the appointment and investiture of the bishops and only conceded a right of confirmation to the Roman Pope. No pope was to be recognized by his clergy without his consent, papal letters were first to be laid before the king. In close alliance with William, Lanfranc also took up a cold attitude towards the claims of the Pope. At the Synod of 1076 (Winton.) he contented himself with the absolute prohibition of the marriage of priests only in the case of the **canonical clergy**, the married secular clergy were protected in their position, and only in future was no one to be consecrated without the vow of celibacy. But the repeated desire of the Pope that William should swear fidelity to him and his successors, William rejected with quiet coldness, while he promised to pay the usual sums to Rome. Nevertheless Gregory VII. guarded himself against irritating him; when his legate had suspended refractory Norman bishops, he caused them to be reinstated out of regard for the king, in order wherever possible to win him by gentleness.

3. Gregory's successors and the Controversy on Investiture down to the Concordat of Worms.

Sources: VICTORIS III. (Desiderii) *dialogi de miraculis S. Bened.* in MAB. A. S. IV. (Ml. 149). URBANI II. *epp.* in Ml. 151. The *epp.* and *opp.* Paschalis II., Gelasii II. and Calixti II. in Ml. 163. *Literature*: E. Gervais, *Politische Geschichte Deutschlands unter Heinrich V. und Lothar, II.* 2 vols., Leipzig 1841; DRUFFEL, *K. Heinrich IV. u. seine Söhne*, Regensburg 1863; M. F. STERN, *Zur Biographie Urbans II.*, Berlin, 1883; SCHUM, *Die Politik des Papstes Paschalis II. gegen K. Heinrich V.* in *Jbb. d. Akad. der Wissensch.*, Erfurt 1877; M. MAURER, *P. Calixt II.*, vol. i. München 1886. —E. BERNHEIM, *Zur Geschichte des Wormser Concordats*, 1878; Id. in ZKG. 7, 303 sqq.

Henry IV. had remained victor and in the next succeeding years acquired the decided preponderance in Germany and Italy. But the ecclesiastical reforming party regarded Gregory as a martyr of the holy cause; they now elevated the enthusiastic admirer of Gregory, the abbot DESIDERIUS of Monte Casino, as VICTOR III. (1085-1087), who however was hard pressed by the imperial pope, Clement III. His successor also, URBAN II. (1088-1090), the French Cluniac Otto, Bishop of Ostia, had to relinquish Rome to the imperial pope. The efforts after peace of the princes, who desired to induce Henry to allow his pope to fall, were wrecked on the point that Henry would not sacrifice the bishops of his party. But Urban's power soon increased. Already in 1089 he brought about the marriage (which certainly was soon dissolved again) of the much older Countess Matilda with the son of the most dangerous enemy of Henry IV., Duke Welf the younger of Bavaria. In **Lombardy** the democratic party of the **Pataria**, which was at the same time adverse to the German rule, gained the preponderance in opposition to the imperially disposed bishops, as again the greater part of the bishops' rights of superiority passed over to the rising cities, an event which the Pope willingly permitted to occur **in this case**. Henry's cause was again injured by the revolt of his son CONRAD, who was made King of Italy. But Urban II. was specially assisted by the enthusiasm for the **Crusades** which had been kindled since 1094, and which placed him as the intellectual chief of this powerful movement at the head of the West. At the synod held by Urban in **Piacenza** (March, 1095) in the midst of the schismatics of Lombardy, the growing strength of his party showed itself, and at the brilliant assembly of **Clermont** (November, 1095), where he invited men to the crusade under promise of plenary indulgence, he was able at the same time to carry through his measures against King Philip of France.

The latter had repudiated his wife Bertha in 1092, in order to enter upon a new marriage with Bertrada, who had separated from her husband the Count of Anjou. Bishop Ivo of Chartres, supported by Urban, had energetically protested against the audacity of the king and had been summoned to trial for high treason by a council at Rheims which was complaisant to the king. The Pope, to whom Ivo appealed, had now caused the ban to be uttered against the king by his legates at Autun. Philip submitted in appearance only and was released from the ban. But at Clermont Urban renewed the ban against the king.

Here also Urban took up the **question of investiture** in the spirit of Gregory. In Germany, where the crusading enthusiasm was not yet kindled, Henry indeed retained the upper hand. But Urban II. entered Rome triumphantly accompanied by crusaders, and his opponent Clement here lost all importance. Towards the **Normans**, however, Urban was obliged to enter into a method of procedure which entirely deviated from his principles, in order not to lose indispensable allies. To Count Roger of Sicily and his descendants he gave the privilege,¹ that no papal legate should ever be sent into his land against his will, but that the pope would much rather always apply to Roger and his successors as his legates.²

His successor PASCHAL II. (1099–1118) had to continue the conflicts which were begun.

For a few years at least he brought to obedience King PHILIP of France, on whom (1100) at the Synod of Poitiers he anew imposed the ban on account of continued adultery. In **England**, WILLIAM RUFUS like his father had kept the dominion over the Church entirely in his own hand, treated the holders of ecclesiastical dignities entirely on an equal footing with the secular barons, and ruthlessly practised simony. ANSELM of Bec, whom William (1093) had made Archbishop of Canterbury, effected his recognition by Urban II., but refused to pay to the king the usual sums for his confirmation, journeyed to Rome and, while his archbishopric was laid under arrest, lived in Italy as an exile, in close relationship with Urban, who also invited his counsel in his negotiations with the Greeks (*vid. infra*). William's son Henry I. (Beauclerc) did indeed recall him, but when he would not take the oath of fealty to the king, new conflicts arose. After Anselm for this reason had betaken himself to Urban in Rome and had threatened the king with the ban, the agreement was arrived at that in the investiture Henry should dispense with the ring and staff, but the **oath of fealty** was conceded him.

In Germany it seemed that the disturbing internal quarrel was to be finally at rest and Henry IV. to attain undisputed dominion. But Paschal encouraged the making of war upon the spiritual domains of Cambray and Liège, which had remained faithful to the Emperor Henry (Siegebert of Gemblours!), by Count Robert of Flanders, who had returned from the Holy Land, and who here raged with fire and

¹ MANSI, 20, 659.

² The foundation for the so-called *Monarchia ecclesiastica Siciliæ*; *vid. F. J. SENTIS, Monarchia Sicula*, Freib. 1869.

sword in a new sort of crusade. Paschal renewed the ban against Henry, the power of which, already flagging, was accentuated anew by the rising of Henry the son (afterwards Henry V.) against his father. When HENRY IV. had died deserted and excommunicated at Liège in 1106, the Pope released the German clergy from the ban, but renewed the prohibition of investiture. Henry V. had indeed shown himself very devout towards the Church and the papal legates at the assembly at **Nordhausen** (May, 1105), but as **Emperor he was obliged** to take up the same declinatory standpoint as his father **in the matter of the investiture**. He said that he knew of no other means of instituting the bishops in their bishoprics. If the king did not confirm them upon them, the vassals would not obey them, and their declarations of law would have no force; and also the royal authority was indispensable for the avoidance of irregular elections. At the same time all simony was to be avoided, and **canonical** election, but of course under royal confirmation, was to be conceded. The king's ambassadors in vain asserted these views at the assembly at Châlons in 1107. The hopes entertained in the papal party in Upper Italy, which had greatly risen on account of the death of Henry IV., were already depressed at the Synod at Guastalla in 1106¹ by the reserved attitude of the German bishops sent by Henry V., and the imposing progress to Rome of the latter, who also restrained the spirit of the aspiring Lombard cities and compelled Matilda to fulfil her feudal obligations, now brought Pope Paschal into severe embarrassment. In the negotiations on investiture the Pope made the remarkable **proposal**: that the Church should renounce all royalties and content itself with its purely ecclesiastical (freehold) estates and ecclesiastical revenues (tithes and offerings). In 1111 a treaty was actually established according to which, under **this condition** the king at the imperial coronation was to renounce the investiture and secure the heritage of S. Peter, but the Pope was to command the clergy to restore to the Empire everything which the Church had for centuries received on feudal tenure from the Empire (principalities, counties, rights of coining, of market, of toll, imperial prefectures, courts, castles, etc.). This would have been an end of the Church's tenure of political power, and the Empire would have been thrown into confusion. Hence the public reading of the treaty in S. Peter's before Henry's coronation aroused a great tumult and could not be carried to a conclusion. But Paschal along with the cardinals was in the power of Henry

¹ Where it was purposed to dig up the corpse of Wibert of Ravenna, throw it into the water, and humiliate the proud Archbishop of Ravenna.

(who kept him prisoner for two months) and, in April, 1111, had to agree to concede the investiture to the Emperor under condition of free canonical election without simony; ecclesiastical consecration was only to ensue **after** the royal confirmation and investiture. At the same time Paschal was obliged to promise the Emperor on oath, never to excommunicate him and to crown him forthwith, which took place. But the pressure of the ecclesiastical party of action, which was exasperated by this obsequiousness on the part of the Pope, compelled him practically to withdraw his concessions at the Lateran Synod of 1112. The Pope declared that he would personally maintain his oath, not excommunicate the king or trouble about the investiture, but as the treaty was objectionable, the synod must decide upon it. **The synod rejected it unanimously**; and the Pope permitted the issue of the ban against the Emperor by his legates in France and Burgundy. But in spite of the revolt in Germany (Saxony) this was still unable to shake the attitude of Henry. He came for a second time to Italy, where the death of the Margravine Matilda (1115) who had bequeathed her great property in land to the papal see, occasioned a controversy which was equally important for the Empire and the chair of Peter, seeing that along with the allodial property considerable imperial fiefs belonged to this landed estate. Paschal, who besides was greatly tossed about by local party quarrels, fled before the Emperor, but once more returned to Rome in 1118, but died in the same year. Against GREGORY VIII. who was now elevated by the imperial party, GELASIUS II., who was elected by the rest of the cardinals, could not maintain himself in Rome and Italy. But in France and especially in Clugny he found the best reception, and his opponent did not obtain practical ecclesiastical authority. France now became more and more the real fulcrum of the ecclesiastical movement. Here Gelasius died in 1119, and the cardinals elevated Archbishop GUIDO of Vienna, a descendant of the ancient Burgundian royal house, who was related to Henry, as CALIXTUS II. (1119-1124). He was a man of decided ecclesiastical disposition, astuteness and firmness, who at once gained the votes at Rome. After vain negotiations Calixtus renewed at Rheims (in 1119) the prohibition of simony and investiture and the ban against the Emperor, and soon thereafter, drawn by the opinion of the Church and supported by France, returned to Rome where the anti-pope was treated with ignominy and kept prisoner, while, in Germany, amid the conflicts of which Archbishop Albert of Mayence was the soul, Henry's attention was abundantly occupied. But the desire for a return to an assured state of law asserted itself im-

periously in Germany, and the princes of the Empire, who had learned to know their power in these conflicts, brought about the **imperial peace of Wurzburg** in 1121. The way was being paved for an adjustment of the spiritual and secular claims. The more moderate canonical view, as already represented by Ivo of Chartres and others, and newly founded by Hugo of Fleury,¹ asserted itself, and Calixtus II., a princely man of wider horizon than his monastically-narrowed predecessors, responded to their wishes. A **synod of the Empire at Mayence** negotiated with the papal legate, and the united **Concordat** was proclaimed on the plain of **Worms**, on the **23rd September, 1122**, in the open air and in presence of an incalculable multitude of people, and was sworn to by the Emperor and the legate. The **Emperor renounced the investiture with ring and staff**, promised to allow free **canonical** election and ecclesiastical consecration (*absque simonia et aliqua violentia*), the **Pope** conceded that the **election of the bishops** and abbots in the Empire should take place in the **presence of the Emperor** or his representative, the feudal investiture with the properties and rights of the Church should ensue by royal investiture with the **sceptre**, and the **bishops** should **swear fealty** to the king and render what they owed from their properties to the Empire. Thus, formally, free ecclesiastical election was to take place, but in **Germany** ecclesiastical consecration was not to ensue before the **investiture and rendering of the oath as vassal**, whereby, as the king was not bound to invest or confirm **every** elected person, the election as a rule of persons pleasing the king seemed secured, while also the use of the royal influence in contested elections was conceded. All the same, this held good in its full extent only for **Germany**, while for the rest of the Empire, *i.e.* for Italy and Burgundy (Arelate), the transference of the royalties was only to ensue **after** ecclesiastical consecration, and indeed within six months. At the great Lateran Council of 1123, the **first general**, this **Concordat of Worms** was confirmed.

¹ *Tractatus de regia potestate et sacerdot. dignitate*, Ml. 163.

4. The succeeding Popes down to 1154 and Arnold of Brescia.

Sources : Honorius II. in *ML.* 66. *Narratio* electionis Lotharii *MGS.* XII. 511. INNOCENTI II. (and his next successors Coel. and Luc. II.) *opp.* *ML.* 179, Eugenii III. *ML.* 180.—On ARNOLD of Brescia, OTTO FRISING *de gestis Friderici I.* *MGS.* XX. and *Script. rer. Germ.*, 2nd ed. rec. Waitz, Hannov. 1884: I., 28 sqq. (27), II., 28 (Joh. Saresb.) *historia pontific.* *MGS.* XX., 537. BERNHARDI CLARAEV. *epp.* *ML.* 182, 361.—*Literature* : W. BERNHARDI, *Lothar von Supplimburg*, Leipzig 1879; W. BERNHARDI, *Konrad III.* 2 vols., 1883. W. GIESEBRECHT, *Arnold von Brescia* in *SBA.* 1873; R. BREYER in *HTb.* VI. F., vol. 8, Leipzig 1889.

Amid frightful conflicts a result which was certainly somewhat meagre had been reached. The German monarchy was weakened, the power of the princes as against the German imperial government was set free; the hierarchy proceeding from Rome was essentially strengthened, the papacy, which from the time of Hildebrand lay in the choice of the cardinals, had emancipated itself from the Empire and by the spiritual investiture had bound the clergy of the different countries more closely to itself and, on the other hand, had loosened their connection with the feudal state, and by means of canonical election had placed the spiritual power more freely at its own disposal. The idea of a Christian monarchy, as conceived by Charlemagne, had been replaced by that of a universal spiritual-hierarchical empire, which everywhere inserted itself like a wedge into the secular kingdoms. But the abstract theories of a hierarchical theocracy, which would necessarily have split up the kingdoms of this world or given them as vassals into the hands of the spiritual monarch, had been broken and mollified by the force of circumstances, so that the spiritual members of the kingdom were not entirely alienated from national interests. On the other hand a war of ideas had been let loose, which led further.

Calixtus II. was followed by HONORIUS II. (1124–1130), Henry V. by the Saxon LOTHAR III. of Supplimburg (1125–1137), an opponent of Henry's, who entered into friendly relations with the Pope. Even if he did not abandon essential ordinances of the Concordat of Worms, the Pope nevertheless seems really to have been approached for his confirmation of the election. After the death of Honorius, INNOCENT II. (1130–43) was opposed by a minority of the cardinals to ANACLETUS II. who was elected by the majority, and belonged to a family of Jewish descent which had become rich through usury and financial speculation. Elevated by bribery, he maintained himself in popular favour by giving away the treasures of the Church and leaned for support on Roger of Sicily. But Innocent found his support in France among ruling personages like BERNARD

and was acknowledged by the West with the exception of Italy. **LOTHAR**, who conducted him to Rome, was crowned by him in the Lateran church (as **Anacletus** still held **S. Peter's**) and invested with the properties of **Matilda**. After the death of **Anacletus** (1138) the (Second General) Lateran Council was able to celebrate the restoration of the peace of the Church in 1139. But **Innocent**, in the conflict with King **Roger** and the revolted cities of the papal domain, had to experience the renunciation of obedience to him by Rome itself, which, after the model of the Lombard cities, elected its own government and revived the senate of the Roman Republic.

The next successors of **Innocent II.**, **CÆLESTINE II.** (*ob.* 1144) and **LUCIUS II.** (*ob.* 1145) had to deal with the restless Rome, which nominated a **Patricius**, who was to take possession of the royalties of the Pope. The Cistercian, pupil and friend of **S. Bernard**, who was elevated to the papal see as **EUGENIUS III.** (1145-1153), did indeed end the quarrel with Rome by recognising the representation of the city, and in return received the concession of the right of investiture of the senators; but his remaining in Rome was not yet to last; France became essentially his refuge. Here he enjoyed the highest reverence, being guided and supported by **Bernard's** spiritual authority. The news of the fall of **Edessa** (1146) which threatened the kingdom of **Jerusalem**, strengthened the enthusiasm for a **new crusade**, which was nourished and deepened by **Bernard's** striking preaching of penance. **Eugenius** not only promised full indulgence to the participators, as **Urban** had once done, but also freed debtors, if they took the cross, from the payment of arrears of interest, and gave feudal tenants the right, if their liege lords would not lend them the necessary money, to pledge their properties to the Church or pious laymen. In Germany also **Bernard's** appeal now worked; the **Hohenstaufen CONRAD** (1138-1152) took the cross like the French **Lewis VII.** But in spite of the enthusiastic promises the affair came to a pitiful end.

In Rome meanwhile the republican movement had won new importance through the interference of **ARNOLD** of **Brescia**.

This strenuously ascetic priest, filled with the **ideal of the life of poverty of Christ and the apostles**, had previously preached stirringly at **Brescia** against **all secular property of the clergy**; priests were only to live on the tithes and free gifts of believers; bishops and abbots to hold no royalties. The strictly spiritual voice found a lively echo in the rising cities with their republican leanings. It was, as it were, the continuation of the democratic **Pataria**, which now however, in consequence, turned their aim also against the dominant church itself. **Arnold** was accused by his bishop, and at the Lateran Synod of 1139 deposed from his office and expelled from Italy. He betook himself to France, attached himself to **Abelard**, and himself taught in Paris

that "which greatly agreed with the **law** of Christians, but stood in opposition to their **life**." Bernard, who carried through the condemnation of Abelard at the Synod of **Sens** (1141), also effected Arnold's expulsion from Paris. In Switzerland, however, the latter found a patron in a cardinal, with whom he returned to Italy in 1145. Here he received Eugenius's pardon, and devoted himself in Rome to the works of penance imposed on him, but was caught by the republican movement there. Rome desired to see **all priestly dominion** abolished and the clergy limited to their purely spiritual functions, and in so doing sought to obtain support in Conrad III. Rome, they thought, was again to become in the old Roman sense the **centre and source** of the imperial power, and Conrad, from this centre, was to play the part of a Constantine or a Justinian. By his sermons ARNOLD gathered a party of adherents who were highly esteemed among the people on account of their strict morality : the **sect of the Lombards**. He bound himself by an oath to the Roman senate and the Republic, preached against pride, avarice and all the vices of the cardinals ; against the Pope, who, he said, was no shepherd of souls but a man of blood, who covered incendiarisms and bloodshed with his authority ; called him a tormentor of the Church, oppressor of innocence and the like ; and in spite of the Pope, Rome adhered to Arnold, both on the return of Eugenius in November, 1149, and also on his later return in 1152.

BERNARD of Clairvaux also desired in his own fashion, as Arnold did in his, to lead back the papacy from secularization to its true spiritual purity. "Who will give me, before I die, to see the Church as it was in the ancient days, when the Apostles cast their nets to catch souls, not silver and gold ?" When his personal intercourse with Eugenius ceased, he addressed to him his book *De consideratione*. With great frankness he warned him against the secular conduct of the papal rule, in which, he said, the popes were the successors not of the Apostles but of Constantine. He saw that the alliance of *dominatus* and *apostolatus* must destroy both, but all the same maintained the theocratic claims of the papacy, which must have deprived his exhortations of effect. Only the monitions not to injure the ecclesiastical organism of authority by arbitrary interferences with the rights of the bishops, could to some extent consist with it. The book, however, had an important influence on subsequent times ; even Wiclif highly esteemed it.

Eugenius was unable to overcome the anti-hierarchical and republican movement in Rome. But it was now also directed against the EMPEROR FREDERICK I., who had succeeded Conrad in 1152 ; Rome would not recognise him before he had received the imperial rank from the Roman senate and people. This brought Eugenius closer to the Emperor Frederick I. In return for the promise of the imperial coronation, Frederick engaged to bring the Romans to obedience to the Pope and not to make peace with the Romans and Roger of Sicily without the Pope. The powerful appearance of Frederick in the first Roman campaign (1154), the assertion of his imperial rights and the subjection of the Lombard cities did indeed already arouse the apprehensions of Eugenius III. ; but it only came to conflict after his death and that of his successor Anastasius IV. (1154), who only reigned a short time.

5. The Popes Hadrian IV. (1154-59) and Alexander III. (1159-81), and the Hohenstaufen Frederick I. Barbarossa (1152-90).

Sources: MANSI XXI.; Hadrian IV.'s *opp.* Ml. 188, Alexander III.'s Ml. 200; OTTO FRISING, and his continuators Rahewin, and Otto of St. Blasien, *vid.* Wttb. Thomas a'Becket's Lives of Herbert of Boscama, William Fitzstephen and John of Salisbury and others, in the *opp. Thom. Cant.*, by Giles and Ml. 190 and 199. Robertson, *Materials for the hist. of Th. B.*, 3 vols., London 1876-81.—*Literature*: H. REUTER, *Alex. III.*, 3 vols. (vol. i., 2nd ed.), Leipz. 1860 and 64. Along with the works on the history of the world, Fr. von RAUMER, *Geschichte der Hohenstaufen*, 4th ed., Leipzig 1871, and W. GIESEBRECHT, *Kaisergeschichte*, vols. 4-6; H. PRUTZ, *Friedrich I.*, 3 vols., 1871.

In HADRIAN IV., an Englishman (Breakspear) by birth, who after adventurous fortunes had been promoted a cardinal by Eugenius III., and employed in important concerns (*vid.* Northern Mission), a most highly important and energetic man ascended the papal chair. He was successful in expelling the dangerous reformer ARNOLD, who fell into the hands of the Emperor in Upper Italy and was delivered by him to the Roman prefect of the city; he was hanged and his body burned. Frederick contemptuously rejected the desire of the Romans that he should receive the imperial crown at their hands. In spite of many frictions with Hadrian, Frederick agreed to the ceremony of holding the stirrup, and was crowned by the Pope in Rome in June, 1155, by which he estranged the hearts of the Romans. The Pope fleeing from Rome with all the cardinals, in vain expected the help promised by Frederick against the Romans and King William I. of Sicily. He made his peace with William, on whom he conferred Sicily, Apulia, Capua, Naples, etc., without regarding the Emperor's claims on Apulia.

Great embitterment was created at the Diet at **Besançon** (1157), by a letter of the Pope, in which with many reproaches he reminded him of the benefit of the imperial dignity which he had received from the Pope. By the expressions used (*beneficium* and *conferre*), he seemed to designate the emperorship as a **fief of the Pope's**. People were reminded of a picture of the coronation of Lothar (who certainly was invested by the Pope with the **allodia** of the properties of Matilda, which could now be explained by reference to the emperorship).¹ The Pope's legate, Cardinal ROLAND (afterwards Alexander II.), actually expressed himself in this sense. In view of the universal indignation the Roman ambassadors were obliged to leave the Diet at once. Frederick now pointed out to the Pope, that God had exalted the Church in Rome through the

¹ Post homo fit Papæ, sumit quo dante coronam.

Empire, and that now the Church sought to destroy the Empire. The Pope apologised, and gave a milder meaning to his earlier expressions, when Frederick about the same time prepared to start a second time for Italy. At the brilliant **Diet on the Plain of Roncaglia** in 1158 (after the first humiliation of Milan), Frederick caused the imperial rights to be recorded by jurists from Bologna.

The question concerned all rights, which had been regarded in Italy from ancient times as **royalties**, of which, however, many had become lost to the crown. Bishops and lords were required to recognise them as such, and Frederick confirmed all of them which could demonstrate that they had been legitimately obtained by royal conferment. But the claims of the Emperor on imperial fiefs which had long become lost, and the extravagant expressions as to the absoluteness of the imperial power, which corresponded not to historical circumstances but to Roman juristic theory, provoked discord.

The Pope required that the Emperor should not exercise rights of sovereignty in Rome through *nuntii*, and that he should demand no **feudal oath** from the Italian bishops, and reproached him with hindering his legates in Germany. The Emperor rejected the first demand which, he said, would make the emperorship in Rome itself an empty name; from the bishops he desired no feudal oath if they would renounce the royalties; but said that the legates only came to Germany to plunder and satisfy Roman avarice. HADRIAN was on the point of a rupture with the Emperor, when he died in 1159. The imperially-inclined minority of the cardinals now elected VICTOR IV., while the papal-hierarchical and at the same time Sicilian party elected Cardinal Roland of Siena as ALEXANDER III. (1159-81). A synod at Pavia (1160) attended by only about fifty German and Lombard bishops declared for Victor, while ALEXANDER and his party protested. In face of the existing predominance of the Emperor in Italy, Alexander fled by ship to Genoa, and after the fall of Milan (1st March, 1162), to France. At the common Synod of Toulouse (autumn of 1160), the kings Henry II. of England and Lewis of France had decided in favour of Alexander, and the attempts of Frederick I. to draw to his side Lewis, who had been enraged by secret arrangements between Henry II. and Alexander III., were broken off. Alexander was able to hold a solemn council at **Tours** in 1163, at which the anti-pope and his helpers, above all the right hand of the Emperor in all these affairs, RAINALD of Dassel, Bishop-elect of Cologne, were laid under anathema. Even in Germany a preponderating part of the clergy and the monks (though of the German archbishops only Eberhard of Salzburg and the native of Cologne Conrad of Wittelsbach, who had been ousted

by the Emperor) stood on the side of Alexander, or willed and desired a decision by a general council. The important **Cistercians** in particular championed Alexander, and many who were refugees for this reason assembled in France. The anti-pope Victor died in 1164, during the third presence of Frederick in Italy, and Rainald of Dassel speedily pushed on the election of a new anti-pope, **PASCHAL III.** At the assembly at **Wurzburg** in 1165, from which many absented themselves entirely, inclination towards concession was not wanting, and the insecure situation of the imperial pope was little concealed by the measures against the resisting clergy, the deposition of Archbishop Eberhardt of Salzburg, and the confident appearance of Rainald of Dassel, now really consecrated archbishop, who with the approval of Paschal III. carried out the canonization of Charlemagne. Henry II. also, who had already fallen into serious quarrels on account of Thomas Becket, began to take up an ambiguous attitude on the papal question. But the alliance into which the interests of Alexander came with those of the **Lombard cities** was decisive. The League of **Verona** had been formed in 1161; Alexander was able to return to Italy in 1165; the league was expanded in 1167 into a **general league of the Lombard cities**. A limit was placed on the fortunate advance of the Emperor on Italy in the **fourth** Roman campaign by the outbreak of the terrible plague in the army in 1167. Frederick was obliged to escape to Germany. Here he indeed adhered to the schism (Paschal was succeeded by another anti-pope, Calixtus III., in 1168), but after, when on his **fifth** Roman campaign, he had been left in the lurch by Henry the Lion, and had suffered a decided defeat from the Lombards at the battle near **Legnano** (1176), he sought to make his peace with Alexander. While with the Lombards he only concluded a six-years' armistice, with his other Italian opponent, William of Sicily, one of fifteen years; he now dropped Calixtus, acknowledged Alexander and gave back all the conquered territories to the Roman Church, although also *salvo omni iure imperii*.¹

It was a great moral defeat. Pope Alexander advanced as victor and the gaping wound of the schism closed.

The result which ALEXANDER derived from this in **England** was very important. The English clergy, who under William I. and II.

¹ For the solemn conclusion of peace at Venice, on the basis of the adjustments previously agreed upon, *vid.* MGL. II., 147. Cf. on account of the words omitted in Sigonius, THEINER, *Cod. dipl. dominic. tempor. s. sedis* Rom. 1861, p. 22, No. 30.

and Henry I. had been held in strict dependence on the English crown, had indeed to suffer the most severe oppressions under Stephen of Blois (1135-54), but had received from him when in a hard-pressed situation sworn promises as to the liberties of the Church, unhindered alliance with Rome and exemption of the clergy from civil jurisdiction. In the spirit of the earlier Norman rulers HENRY II. desired to assert the old views and return to the old *consuetudines*. At the **Synod of Chester** (1157) he contrasted the royal authority as instituted by God, with the papal as only derived from men.¹ Henry had elevated the Archdeacon of the arch-see of Canterbury, his chancellor THOMAS BECKET, a man who had formerly been very devoted to him, to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. But the latter now grasped with entire tenacity and energy the hierarchical idea of the **freedom of the ecclesiastical authority**. At the assembly of the kingdom at **Winchester**, Henry required that if the archdeacon should have to judge the clergy, a royal official should be given him as his assistant, and further, that a cleric who became guilty of gross offence should after his clerical degradation be handed over to the royal court of justice for further punishment. The wavering bishops were induced to resistance by Becket. And in accordance with Becket's advice the bishops would only undertake an indefinite obligation to the *consuetudines avitæ* with the evasive formula: *salvo ordine nostro et iure ecclesiæ*. At the assembly of the kingdom at **Clarendon** (1164) Becket allowed himself to be induced by the exertions of the king to promise further to keep the ancient *consuetudines* "*bona fide*." These *consuetudines* were codified by a commission in the 16 **Articles of Clarendon**, which declared the authority of the king over the English clergy, his influence on the election of prelates and especially the royal jurisdiction over the clergy, and greatly augmented the difficulty of the alliance of the English prelates with Rome.

The royal court is to be highest judicial court of appeal, which decides whether accused clergy are to be tried before it or before the ecclesiastical tribunal. Appeals by the clergy go from the bishop to the archbishop, from the latter to the royal court, in order that the king may restrain the archbishops from allowing the right in question from being transgressed. Also in controversies as to property between clergy and laity the royal court of justice forms the final court of appeal. Clergy condemned by the royal court are not to be protected from punishment by the bishop. Prelates may not go without the country without the royal permission. Bishops, in so far as they occupy royal fiefs, stand on equal footing with the secular barons, as in their rights so also in their obligations. The king has the right to draw the revenues of the prelates

¹ Hefele, V. 570.

on occasion of vacancies. The elections of bishops are to take place by the *potiores personæ ecclesiæ* summoned by the king and under the king's approval. The elected have to render the oath of fealty.

Thomas Becket also accepted these *capitula*, and supported by letter the request of the king that Alexander should give them his approval. But he soon appeared as a penitent on account of this compliance, had himself released from his oath by the Pope, and was obliged by the anger of the king, who put him on his trial before the convention of secular and spiritual magnates at Northampton, to take refuge in France, where he was protected by Lewis VII.

Alexander, at first more moderate than Thomas Becket, yet in 1166 proceeded with spiritual weapons against the "robbers of the Church," *i.e.* all on whom the king had bestowed the administration and usufruct of the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury. While Alexander now appointed Becket apostolic legate for the whole of England (except the province of York), an assembly of the realm held at **Chinon** near **Tours**, and so in the Norman domain, in presence of King Henry, determined on an appeal of the entire English clergy to the Pope, which was actually carried out at the Synod of London in 1166 under Becket's chief opponent, Bishop GILBERT of London. English ambassadors, supported by English money, then effected in Rome the sending by Alexander of legates to England for the settlement of the controversy, declared some further measures of Thomas Becket's to be without effect till the decision, and released the ban which he had uttered against the councillors of the king. The procedure of Alexander, who had to fear an alliance of Henry with the Emperor Frederick, was not without diplomatic ambiguity, and Henry, out of regard to the tendency among the clergy, had to guard himself against allowing matters to come to extremes. An attempted reconciliation between the two kings and Becket (Montmirail, 1169) was wrecked by Becket's obstinacy and only succeeded at La Ferté Villeneuve, but even then only without a clear settlement of the conflict, for Becket received from the Pope a secret permission, only to be used in case of necessity, to excommunicate and suspend "the seducers of the King," ROGER of York and GILBERT of London. Becket, on the point of returning to England, sent on the bull of excommunication in advance, and thereby excited the anger of the king anew. The latter in displeasure let fall the words which four knights interpreted as an encouragement to the murder of Becket, which they carried out in December, 1170, in the cathedral at Canterbury.

The blame fell upon the king; Becket appeared as a martyr of the holy cause. In return for the promise of complete subjection to Alexander's judgment the king obtained the concession that the Pope on Thursday in Passion Week of 1171 only excommunicated generally the originators and instigators of the murder. In May, 1172, Henry rendered the oath of obedience to the Pope at Avrengé, made appeal to Rome free, promised a crusade, pardon for all clergy of Becket's party, and abolition of all customs injurious to the Church which had come into vogue during his reign. Thomas Becket was canonized, and the king, who was harassed by his own sons, did public penance at Becket's grave.

Alexander, who confirmed the independence of Alphonso I. of Portugal and awarded him all conquests on the Saracen domains, at the height of his authority in 1197 held the **Third Œcumenical Lateran Synod**, which ordained that a third of the votes of the cardinals were to be requisite for the valid election of a pope. The complete freedom from taxation of spiritual properties and the exemption of the clergy from secular jurisdiction were most strongly emphasized.

6. The Papacy from the death of Alexander III. to that of Innocent III.¹

Sources : The Letters of Innocent III., one book for each year of the pontificate, under the title *Regesta* (Bk. 4. 17-19 are lost), edited partly by St. BALUZE, partly by BREQUIGNY and DU THEIL, together also in the *opp.* ed. Ml. 214-217; here also the *Registrum super negotio Rom. Imp.* and the *Gesta Innocentii* by an anonymous author. *Vita Innocentii III. ex manuscr. Bern. Guidonis* in Muratori, *rer. Ital. sc.* III. 1, 480. J. Fr. BÖHMER, *die Regesten des Kaiserreichs* (1198-1224); 2 vols., Stuttg. 1847-49. On Philip of Swabia and Otto IV.: the works of O. ABEL (1852 and 1856) and WINKELMANN, *Phil. von Schw. u. Otto IV.*, 2 vols., 1873 and '78. Relation to England: PAULI, *Gesch. Engl.*, 3rd vol. From here onwards: O. LORENZ, *Deutsche Gesch. des 13. u. 14. Jh.*, 2 vols., Wien 1863-69.

ALEXANDER's successors, who followed in quick succession, have again to deal with the refractory spirit of Rome, while Frederick I., after the subjection of Henry the Lion, was reconciled with Lombardy in the peace of Constance in 1183. The Lombards swore the oath of fealty to him and retained the royalties within the cities, while for the others they required the imperial confirmation. After the brilliant **Diet of Mayence** in 1184, Frederick marched for the sixth time to Italy, and married his son HENRY to CONSTANCE, the heiress of Sicily, the nearest relation of the childless king William II., thereby opened to his house the prospect of ruling over the whole of Italy and withdrew from the papacy this important support against the imperial preponderance. Friction was not wanting between Frederick and popes Lucian and, especially, Urban, who belonged to a Milanese family which had been injured by Frederick; so especially in the contested episcopal election in Trèves, for which Urban in contradiction of his former promise consecrated Volkmar, one of the candidates, with his own hand. Urban's death averted a rupture. Clement III., who succeeded in subjecting the Romans to himself on certain conditions, put an end to the quarrel at Trèves by deposing the obstinate Volkmar. At the same time men's minds received another direction from the fall of Jerusalem. There ensued the Third Crusade, in which Frederick Barbarossa met his death. When, not long after Frederick's departure to the East, King William II. of Sicily died, aversion from the German rule caused the elevation of an illegitimate scion of the native ruling house, Count TANCRED, whom Clement III. in his own interest willingly invested with the fief. It was only after his death in 1194 that Henry (now Henry VI.) was able to enter upon his Italian heritage, which he would not receive as a fief from the Pope. In his powerful position he sternly

¹ Lucius III., 1181-85; Urban III. —October, 1187; Gregory VIII. —December, 1187; Clement III. —1191; Celestine III. —1198; Innocent III. 1198-1216.

and autocratically opposed the aged Pope CELESTINE III. In Germany he dealt with the episcopal sees without regard to him. In Rome and the State of the Church he administered as the secular ruler, and in his Sicilian heritages he proceeded with considerable violence. The detention as a prisoner of RICHARD CŒUR DE LION by Henry was also regarded as an insult to the Pope, as the Church expressly put all crusaders under her protection. Celestine however did not venture to enter upon any enterprise against Henry VI. But all apprehension as to his far-reaching plans disappeared with Henry's early death in 1197, on which his and Constance's son was left a child of three years.

Cardinal LOTHAR, of the house of the CONTI in Anagni, now (1198) ascended the papal throne in the prime of life as INNOCENT III. He had been educated in theology and law in Rome, Paris and Bologna, and placed sagacity and energy at the service of the Church. He at first sought to establish fixed order and undisturbed government in the State of the Church, obtained the oath of fealty to himself from the imperial *Præfectus Urbis*, as well as the Senator who governed in the name of the city, and bound the neighbouring counts and lords to allegiance. Elsewhere in Italy he successfully asserted the claims of the Papal See. The league of the Tuscan cities was approved, the Lombard league renewed. After Henry's death Constance had accepted Sicily as a fief from the Pope in order to secure it to her son against the parties, and indeed with the surrender of the former special ecclesiastical privileges of the crown of Italy (*vid. sup.* p. 262) and in return for the payment of a yearly tax to S. Peter. On her death, however, Constance appointed the Pope himself the guardian of her child, and he protected Frederick's claim over Sicily.

Although FREDERICK II. soon after his birth had been acknowledged as successor in the Empire, the German princes, with a view to having a man at their head, proceeded to a new election which ended in discord. The Hohenstaufen PHILIP of Swabia was opposed by the Guelf OTTO (the son of Henry the Lion). Both parties negotiated with the Pope, who ascribed to himself the right of deciding by a casting vote, since from ancient times the election of a **German King** was the affair of the Germans, because the Pope in transferring the Roman emperorship from the Greeks to the Germans had transferred this right to them; but the Pope, who had to bestow the imperial crown, had of necessity to make trial of the person elected, hence also in the case of a discordant election, he might decide for the one candidate or even choose another.¹ After lengthened delay Innocent decided in March, 1201, for Otto, who

¹ *Vid. the deliberatio* of 1199 in the *Registrum de negotio Romani imperii* No. 29 (ML 216, 1025), and the Decretal *Venerabilem* (*ibid.* 1065 sqq.).

promised him on oath protection of the possessions and rights of the Roman Church and obedience and homage such as the pious and catholic Emperors had been accustomed to show towards the Roman see.¹ But Philip more and more gained ground against Otto, who at first asserted the preponderance, especially in North Germany. The party conflict in Germany became the best ally of the Curia. Philip made considerable promises, and Innocent already began to take steps, by which Otto was to be moved to resign, when Philip fell by the hands of his vassal Otto of Wittelsbach in 1208. Otto, now universally acknowledged by a new election, took a new oath in Italy to the Pope, in which, along with the formerly promised free election of the prelates, *i.e.* practical renunciation of the concessions of the Concordat of Worms, he further promised renunciation of the *ius spolii* and support against the heretics,² and was crowned in 1209. But Otto forthwith sought by stress of arms to regain the imperial rights which had become lost, whereby the disposition made by Innocent in Italy in regard to Sicily and the possessions of Matilda was menaced. When Otto for this purpose severely harassed Frederick in Sicily, the deluded Innocent uttered the ban and deposition against him, and the scion of the hated Hohenstaufen family, Frederick II., on whom he had moreover bestowed an excellent, brilliant and liberal education, was now obliged to serve him against Otto. Frederick engaged further also to regard Sicily as a papal fief, and then, with the support of the Pope and the King of France, marched on Germany (1212), which soon sided with him, while Otto, supported by John of England and fighting for the English claims against France, was worsted at the battle of Bouvines in 1214 against Philip, and thereby at the same time lost his prospects of Germany. Frederick gave the Pope the same promises as Otto,³ and received the German royal crown at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1215.

At the very beginning of his pontificate Innocent had caused the call to the crusade to sound forth anew, especially by means of the preaching of repentance of Fulk of Neuilly. In consequence the movement had arisen which led to the establishment of the Latin Empire in Constantinople under Baldwin of Flanders (1204). However greatly Innocent at first disapproved this deviation from the

¹ The important deed of the 8th June, 1201, drawn up at Neuss, is the foundation of the later privileges of the Roman see.

² MGL. II. 216. Cf. FICKER, *Forschungen zur Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte Italiens*, II. 395; HEFELE, V. 813.

³ Deed of 12th July, 1213, in MGL., II. 224.

true aim, he greeted with joy the fact that the time had come when, after destruction of the golden calves, Israel should return to Judah.

Innocent had manifold opportunities of asserting his voice even against the rest of the princes of the West.

PHILIP AUGUSTUS of France had separated from his wife INGEBURGIS, a Danish princess, immediately after the marriage, and, with the approval of his bishops, had concluded a new alliance with AGNES of Meran. This had been already opposed by Pope Celestine III. (Synod of Compiègne in 1193). After vain admonitions, Innocent laid France under interdict in 1200. The ostensible submission of the king caused it to be repealed. But in truth the disobedience of the King endured till the death of Agnes in 1201, and the actual reconciliation with Ingeburgis only ensued in 1213. Innocent, however, at the desire of the king, resolved to declare the two children of Agnes to be legitimate and capable of the succession, because the king, after his former divorce by the Archbishop of Rheims, had entered into the new alliance *bona fide*.

King SANCHE I. of Portugal sought in vain to free himself from the obligation to the Papal See undertaken by Alphonso. PETER of Aragon had himself crowned in Rome in 1204, in order to strengthen his authority against his powerful vassals and against the claims of Castile, and bound himself to an annual tribute. Subsequently indeed he resisted the Pope, who opposed his divorce. In consequence of the crusading movements, LEO II. of Armenia now sought attachment to Rome.¹ The Bulgarian Prince JOHANNES requested and obtained the crown from Innocent. In Hungary he appeared as arbitrator; But JOHN of England had especially to feel the whole weight of his authority. In John's conflict with Philip of France, Philip was acknowledged as feudal superior by Prince Arthur for Anjou, Maine and Touraine; the murder of Arthur by John led to a new conflict in 1202. John, who by his caprice and inconstancy had roused his own barons against himself, then sought help from the Pope, who also sought to mediate between the two kings, but finally let the matter drop, so that John about 1206 no longer possessed a city on the continent. An opportunity was then afforded to the Pope for interfering anew. In a controversy between the monks of the monastery of the Trinity at Canterbury and the bishops of the ecclesiastical province, as to the right of election, both parties applied to Rome. Innocent recognized the rights of the monks, but cancelled the election which they had overhastily made, and induced their emissaries in Rome to choose another archbishop (1206), viz. his former fellow-student, STEPHEN LANGTON. The ambassadors of the king protested. Innocent sought by letter to gain the consent of the king, although, as he declared, an election carried out before his own eyes did not require the confirmation of a secular prince, seeing that the papal chair was the best safeguard of all right (*Regest.* IX. 206; *ML* 215, 1045). In spite of the opposition of the king he forthwith elected Stephen Langton in 1207. John resisted, expelled the monks from Canterbury, and in 1208 Innocent caused the interdict to be proclaimed against England by English bishops. The latter had to save themselves by flight from the anger of the king, who now expelled numerous clerics and proceeded with the confiscation of clerical property. Innocent then uttered the ban against John, and was able in 1212 to depose King John, who had fallen out with the barons, and assign his land to King Philip of France. He is said to have summoned him to the conquest of England as to a formal crusade, with

¹ HEFELE, V. 802, etc.

the same promises of pardon as in the conflicts for the Holy Sepulchre.¹ John, who could no more trust to his barons, now gave way, acknowledged Stephen Langton, promised to restore all church properties and to recall all banished clergy; and, in accordance with the demand of the Pope expressed by his legate PANDULPH, **made over his land to the Holy see** in atonement for his own and his family's sins, in order to receive it again from the Pope as a **fief**, which was to be binding on all his successors, and promised to pay a considerable yearly sum to Rome in 1213 (*Regest.* 16, 76-78. *ML.* 216, 876). Philip had now to give up his hopes. While Stephen Langton took the lead of the nobility who were discontented with the king, the Papal Legate, Cardinal-bishop Nicholas of Tusculum, took up the humiliated king, caused the posts of the church to be filled up with the creatures of the king, interfered in the jurisdiction of the bishops, and sought to work in Rome through Pandulph against Stephen Langton and for the king. But the barons and prelates now united against the morally annihilated king, and forced *Magna Charta* from him in 1215, which was to become the foundation stone of the independent national development of England. The Pope in vain rejected it, uttered the ban and interdict against the barons, and suspended Stephen Langton because he would not excommunicate them. In the conflict of the barons with the king, which now began, it nearly came about that Lewis, the son of Philip of France, was made king by them, when the death of John altered the situation. In this transaction the cold unscrupulousness of Roman desire to rule comes out with special clearness, playing with the passions of princes, making use of every means and becoming the ally of the most unprincipled prince, as soon as he is broken. The unprecedented Roman exactions of money also came to light here and were scourged in most bitter terms. But the hierarchical policy of the Pope, which would have enslaved a country through its princes, was involuntarily made to give the impulse to the above mentioned national development.²

Towards the end of his life Innocent arranged the **brilliant Fourth General Lateran Synod**, invitations to which were issued to all the patriarchs, archbishops and bishops of Christendom, as well as to the secular potentates, the masters of the knightly orders and the presidents of the great orders of monks, and which was actually attended by 412 bishops, 800 abbots and priors, and very many representatives. Two conflicting candidates for the see of **Constantinople** appeared, but Innocent appointed a third person, the Tuscan priest Gervasius, as Patriarch of Constantinople. The Patriarch of Jerusalem (Acre) and the united Maronite Patriarch also appeared, the (Latin) Patriarch of Antioch, and even the Alexandrian Patriarch of the **Melchites** sent representatives. The council was to advise the reacquisition of the Holy Sepulchre, and arrange comprehensive reforms of the whole Church in doctrine and discipline, and especially to establish measures against **heresy**, which had become too powerful. Innocent himself pronounced the solemn

¹ With Matthæus Paris. *ad ann.* 1212, cf. WINKELMANN, *Philipp von Schwaben*, II. 357, note.

² STUBBS, *The Constitutional History of Engl.*, 1874. I. 520.

opening oration. We shall everywhere meet again the ordinances of this important council, which, as a matter of fact, forms the apex of the papal glory.¹ Innocent raised the conception of Gregory to its highest pitch, and consciously expressed the idea that the Pope was the *vicarius Dei*; **the Lord gave Peter not only the whole Church, but the whole world to rule.** As every knee bows before Christ, so ought all to obey Peter, even kings should not think to rule aright if they do not exert themselves to serve him devotedly. Secular dominion, a mere earthly power, extends to bodies; the spiritual and heavenly to souls. They are related as the two great lights which God has created, the sun and the moon. As accordingly the Pope in God's name can depose princes also, so is he the highest arbiter between them in all controverted cases of law.

7. The Papacy in conflict with Frederick II. and the fall of the Hohenstaufens.²

Sources: The *Vitæ* of the Popes in MURATORI, *scr. r. Ital.* III.; HONORII opp. in HOROV, *med. ævi patr.* I. Par. 1879; HON. epp. in MGE. 13. sæc. I. Regests in POTTHAST and P. PRESSUTI, *reg. Hon.* I., Rom. 1888; WINKELMANN *zu d. Reg.* in FDG. vol. 10, 1870; MANSI, XXIII.; Gregorii IX. *Decret.* l. VI. in the *Corp. iur. can.*—E. BERGER, *les registres d'Innoc. IV.*, Par. 1886 sqq.; Inn. IV. epp. BALUZE *Miscellan.* t. VII.; HÖFLER in BLV. XVI., 2, Stuttg. 1847; WINKELMANN in FDG., vol. 15.—A. HUIILLARD-BRÉHOLLES, *hist. dipl. Fried. II.*, Par. 1852 sqq.; WINKELMANN, *Acta imperii inedita*, I. and II.—*Literature:* The monographs on Frederick II. by F. W. SCHIRRMACHER, Gött. 1859 sqq., and E. WINKELMANN, Berl. 1863; O. LORENZ in HZ. vol. 11th; A. de CHAMBRIER, *die letzten Hohenstaufen und das Papstthum*, Bas. 1876; J. FELTEN, *Papst Gregor IX.*, Freiburg 1886.

HONORIUS III., a man of mild personal character, immediately pushed on on every side the business of the crusade. While Frederick II. hesitated, at first those undertakings of King Andrew of Hungary, and then the conflicts in Egypt, arose, which led to the conquest of Damietta in 1219, which however had again to be evacuated in 1221. Frederick II., full of lofty plans and claims, met the zeal of the Pope with enduring reserve, although he himself had invited him to threaten all who had taken the cross with the ban in case they should not be ready for the undertaking by S. John's day of 1219.³ In 1220 Frederick, against his repeated

¹ Of the acts only the 70 Capitula and a decree in reference to the Crusade are preserved; for Innocent's opening speech *vid.* MANSI, 22, 968, also in Ml. 216, 674.

² Honorius III. 1216-27; Gregory IX. 1227-41; Celestine IV. Sept.-Oct. 1241; Innocent IV. 1243-54; Alexander IV. 1254-61; Urban IV. —1264; Clement IV. —1268.

³ WINKELMANN, *Acta Imp. ined.* p. 127, no. 151.

promise, caused his son HENRY, who had been nominated King of Sicily, to be elected German king (Diet of Frankfort, April, 1220). He had won the prelates by special promises in the Patent¹ of the 26th April, 1220. Frederick confirmed all the privileges which he had bestowed on the Roman Church, and declared that Sicily should never be united to the Empire.² In November, 1220, Honorius carried out the imperial coronation of Frederick in Rome, whereupon Frederick with numerous German and Sicilian magnates took the cross for the second time, but had the term extended. At the same time he abolished all the ordinances and statutes which were injurious to the freedom of the Church by whomsoever they had been issued, confirmed the exemption from taxes of the Church and clerical persons, the exemption of ecclesiastical persons from secular jurisdiction in civil and criminal affairs, declared that all persons who persisted in excommunication for a year on account of violation of the freedom of the Church, *eo ipso* should fall under the imperial ban, and proclaimed outlawry against all heretics.³ But at the same time the Pope had already to complain not only of the delay of the Crusade but also of the interferences of the Emperor in the State of the Church, taxation of the clergy in his Sicilian inheritance, and other matters. The marriage of Frederick with IOLANTHE, the heiress of the claims to the kingdom of Jerusalem, gave a new motive for the undertaking of the crusade, which was now preached by papal legates in Germany also not without success. But more important for Frederick was the arrangement of Italian affairs, especially in his country of Sicily, where he broke the resistance of the nobility to his autocratic rule, and gave great offence to the Pope by transplanting the Saracens of Western Sicily to Lucera, north of Naples. To this was added the revival of the claims of Frederick to Lombardy at the Diet of **Cremona** (1226), in opposition to which the Pope favoured the renewal of the Lombard League. However, at the Emperor's desire he undertook to mediate at the peace-convention at Rome.

When the latest term appointed for the undertaking of the crusade arrived, HONORIUS was already dead, and his place occupied by GREGORY IX., an aged but most energetic man, ecclesiastically of strong though rugged character. Great hosts of crusaders had assembled in Apulia, among whom severe plagues broke out in the

¹ MGL., II. 236.

² MGL., II. 397. Cf. his excuse to the Pope which followed only three months later, in WINKELMANN l.c. p. 156.

³ MGL., II. 243 and Ep., I. 160 and 169.

heat of summer. Among the crusaders signs were not wanting of the failure of enthusiasm. Many allowed themselves to be released from their vows by an impostor, who played himself off as the vicar of the Pope. After long decay Frederick embarked in August, 1227, only to return after a few days, ostensibly on account of illness. At this time the Landgrave of Thuringia died; Frederick appointed the Duke of Limburg in his place as leader, but the army of the cross dissolved in considerable part. Although Frederick had begged for a new postponement, Gregory now laid him under the ban and the place where he was staying under the interdict. Unconcerned as to the ban, Frederick after a year (August, 1228) entered on the crusade with moderate means, and in spite of the ban, in consequence of which the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the Templars and Knights of S. John, denied him all assistance, and only the young Teutonic Order remained on his side, he obtained in 1229 an advantageous armistice for ten years from Sultan Kamel of Egypt, who was engaged in controversies with his nephew, the young Sultan of Damascus. The intimate intercourse of Frederick with the Saracens and the liberal and tolerant utterances which accompanied it, did indeed raise considerable offence, and it was made matter of reproach to him, that in the treaty with Kamel, the city of Jerusalem indeed was given over to the Christians, but the monastery of the Templum Domini was to remain in the occupation of the Saracens.¹ At the persuasion of the Master of the Teutonic Order, the Emperor on account of the ban under which he lay, took the crown from the altar without divine service and consecration, but declared himself ready to be reconciled with the Pope. On the next day the Archbishop of Cæsarea by commission of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, proclaimed the interdict against the church of the Holy Sepulchre and other holy places.² On occasion of Frederick's visit to the Mosque of the Caliph Omar, the words are said to have fallen from him, from which the Saracen eye-witness would infer that Frederick did not believe in the Christian religion.³ Meanwhile the Pope had released the Sicilians from their oath to Frederick and invaded the inheritance of the Emperor. But Frederick, returning in haste, expelled the papal soldiery. The

¹ *Vid.* the treaty. MGL., II. 265, and *ibid.* 261, the Encyclica of the Emperor.

² For the copy of the treaty with the critical remarks of the Patriarch, who certainly censures the considerable concessions to the Saracens and passes over in silence the points favourable to the Christians, *vid.* in RAYNALD, *ad ann.* 1229, Nr. 15 sc. and MG. *Ep.*, I. 380.

³ WINKELMANN, *Frederick III.*, I. 311 sc. and on the contrary SCHIRRMACHER, II. 205.

Pope sought in vain for help from the Lombards, England, France and Germany. His legates had harsh experiences in Germany when they wished to stir the people up against the Emperor. After the **Peace of St. Germano**, concluded with the Pope in 1230, there ensued the release from the ban, and then a meeting with the Pope, at which Frederick promised the restoration of everything that had been wrested from the State of the Church and a series of ecclesiastical concessions for his hereditary land of Sicily. At the same time the Pope had to be content with the fact, that in the Sicilian legislation¹ recorded by Frederick's Chancellor PETRUS DE VINEIS, the subordination of the clergy to the secular power was decidedly expressed, and that at the Diet of **Ravenna**, which was attended by many German princes, Lombardy was declared to be under the ban of the Empire, and an edict was issued against the autonomy of the episcopal cities.² On the other hand Frederick certainly issued stringent declarations against the heretics with the greatest willingness and took the Dominicans under his protection as *inquisitores hereticæ pravitatis* for the whole of Germany.³ Frederick's marriage with the sister of Henry III. of England then followed at the persuasion of the Pope. The mutual relations of the Emperor and the Pope to the Lombards involved one of the most important incitements to continued dissensions. After the castigation of his rebellious son Henry, the conflicts in Lombardy led to Frederick's victory at **Cortenuova** in 1237. His natural son ENZIO obtained by marriage the dominion over Sardinia, over which the Pope asserted ancient claims. The Pope now came forward as the open ally of the Lombards, and finally decreed the ban and deposition against the Emperor in March, 1239.⁴

Remarkable mutual accusations were exchanged between the Pope and the Emperor. The Emperor upbraids the Pope with hindering the repression of the heretics in Lombardy, and regards the papacy as an anti-Christian phenomenon. The Pope reproaches the Emperor with mere unbelief, and declares him to be the Beast in the Apocalypse (xiii. 1 sqq.). The earlier accusations of his intimate intercourse with the Saracens, his entrance into their customs and his contemptuous utterances as to Christian matters culminate in the expression ascribed to, but expressly denied by the Emperor, as to the **three impostors**, Moses, Jesus and Mohammed.⁵ All that is certain is the sharpened anti-

¹ *Vid.* HUILLARD-BRÉHOLLES, IV. 1-178.

² In the German sphere also the so-called **Laws of Worms** exhibit Frederick's effort to limit the rising freedom of the cities, and in opposition to it to strengthen the princely power. MGL., II. 282.

³ MGL., II. 285.

⁴ POTTHAST, Nr. 905.

⁵ The Pope's Encyclical, HUILLARD-BRÉHOLLES, V. 327 sqq. and MGE. 13.

papal disposition and the sceptical tendency which was nourished by Frederick's whole education and the altered state of the times, and which is also expressed elsewhere among those about the Emperor. In this advanced stage of the irreconcilable opposition, the Pope sought in vain to set up a rival Emperor. The German episcopate met the Pope with very discreet considerations. The Bavarian bishops, with Eberhard II. of Salzburg at their head, reminded him how under the intimate connection of the two swords, the injury of the one necessarily affected the other, brought into prominence the painful double position of the German bishops in such conflicts as members of the ecclesiastical and secular organism, censured the Pope for being led away by political motives to his harsh procedure against the Emperor and for allowing himself to be thereby carried away into political agitations.¹ As a matter of fact the Pope sought in every way to stir up the dissension in the German Empire, but the Diet at Eger adhered faithfully to Frederick and sought to bring about peace. The Pope offered the German crown to Robert, the brother of the King of France. The mendicant monks in Germany preached the crusade against Frederick by his commission. But universal unwillingness arose against it. Frederick conquered nearly the whole of the State of the Church (1240). When the Pope summoned an ecclesiastical assembly to Rome, Frederick took away the Genoese ships which were to carry the prelates assembling at Genoa to Rome, and held several Cardinals and other prelates prisoners. Gregory then died in 1241, the same Pope who gave over the inquisition in Languedoc to the Dominicans, and who in 1234 had already caused the crusade to be preached (by CONRAD of Marburg?) against the so-called **Stedingers**, on account of rebellion against the spiritual jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Bremen. Even in the year of his death he wrote a sermon of this sort against the threatening power of the **Tartars**. Gregory's successor CELESTINE IV. soon died, and under the superior power of the Emperor in Italy there now occurred a vacancy of the see for nearly two years, till Frederick released the imprisoned Cardinals, and dissolved the army which encircled Rome. The French already threatened that they would elect a Pope themselves.

Then came the election of INNOCENT IV., whereby Frederick lost one who had hitherto been his friend among the Cardinals, to find in him an irreconcilable enemy. Negotiations between the two remained vain, as the Pope would not give up his Lombard allies, and would have all adherents of the Church admitted to the peace to be concluded with the Emperor. The Pope then escaped to **Lyons**, which indeed belonged to the German Empire, but, surrounded by France, was practically almost independent. Here in 1245 he arranged the **General Council**, the **thirteenth** according to the Roman reckoning, which however was not acknowledged as such by France.² Only some few German prelates took part in it. Among

sæc. I., 750, cf. MGS. XXIII. 941: "*quamdiu durabit truffa ista?*" The Emperor's rejoinder in HUIILL-BRÉH., V. 348. The satirical testament in WINKELMANN, I. 371; REUTER. *Geschichte der relig. Aufklärung*, II. 251 sqq.

¹ HUIILLARD-BRÉHOLLES, V. 398.

² On it *vid.* the two accounts by MATTHEW PARIS and the Anonymus in

those present was also the distressed Latin Emperor of Constantinople. Frederick's cause was here sustained by his judge of the court, THADDÆUS of Suessa. But the Pope no longer allowed himself to be put off by the offers of Frederick; Frederick's ban and deposition were here repeated.

Lewis IX. of France sought in vain to mediate: Frederick even professed readiness to have his orthodoxy examined into by the Archbishop of **Palermo**. In a memorial to all the prelates and believers in England, Frederick acknowledged the full power of the Pope *in spiritualibus*, but contested his right to dispose of secular kingdoms and gave the warning: "a beginning is made with us, an end will be made with other princes and kings." Frederick now dropped every hesitation. In a missive to all the kings and princes of Christendom, etc., he declared that he would exchange the role of the anvil for that of the hammer. The clergy, he said, abused the simplicity of the laity; *his* aim had always been to restore the apostolic life of the clergy as it was in the primitive Church. It was meritorious to remove pernicious riches from the clergy; all princes ought to support him in doing so.¹ Frederick now expelled the **Dominicans** who were hostile to him; in Sicily he suppressed a revolt which had been stirred up by the Pope. But, as in Germany Bishop SIEGFRIED of Mayence had already left the Emperor's party since 1243, so now other bishops also were drawn away by the impression made by the Council, and Rome spared no means of strengthening this clerical opposition.

Finally, at the instigation of the Pope, **four archbishops of the Empire** (Mayence, Trèves, Cologne and Bremen) and a number of bishops, along with some few secular princes, raised Landgrave HENRY RASPE of Thuringia in 1246 to be king (the **Priests' King**), whom the Pope supported with money and letters by means of disguised beggar-monks. But the German princes remained faithful to Frederick; his son, King Conrad, was indeed overcome by the priests' king, but the latter died soon afterwards in 1247. The Pope now presented Frederick's crown to Count WILLIAM of Holland in whose election the bishops already named, but probably no German prince except Duke Henry of Brabant, William's uncle, took part. The Pope exhausted every means of procuring him adherents by money. Then Frederick died on the 13th December, 1250. In his will he delivered up all the rights of the Roman Church, but with reservation of all imperial rights and under the condition that the Church should give back the rights of the Empire. But Innocent, who now returned from Lyons to Italy, caused the crusade to be preached against Conrad.

MANSI, XXIII. 610 sqq. and 633 sqq. In addition the poem **Pavo**, edited by CARAJAN in 1850.

¹ HUIILLARD-BRÉHOLLES, VI. 889 sqq.

While William of Holland with the Pope's help now made some advance in Germany, Conrad went to Italy, where his half-brother Manfred had preserved for him his Italian hereditary land, but met with his death in 1254. Manfred submitted to the Pope on his promise to respect the rights of Conrad's son. But when the Pope nevertheless desired to exercise authority over Sicily, which he offered to the English King Henry III. for his son Edmund, Manfred with the help of his Saracen troops took possession of Apulia, and placed the crown on his own head, as the claims of CONRADIN could not be carried into effect. Meanwhile the stubborn Innocent had died (1254). His successor, Alexander IV., in vain hurled the ban against Manfred, declared for Prince EDMUND and made use of this for exorbitant exactions of money in England, but was unable to prevent Manfred's victorious advance in the State of the Church and Tuscany. But in Germany, where Conradin, under the guardianship of his mother, only possessed his hereditary lands in Swabia, the crown, when William of Holland died in 1256, was sold under papal influence to foreign princes. The Pope threatened the German archbishops, and through them the German princes, with excommunication, if they should elect Conradin.¹ RICHARD of Cornwall and ALPHONZO the WISE of Castile appeared as pretenders. Practically indeed, only RICHARD, who was also crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, had through his money a certain adherence in the Empire. But several German cities which attached themselves to Richard, took from him a written promise that he would release them from their obligation, if the Pope should decide for another than the more legitimate candidate. The latter took Richard's side in 1259. Nevertheless the matter remained undecided, and his successor Urban IV. summoned both pretenders before his tribunal while denying the decision of his predecessor, but in vain. The Ghibelline party in Lombardy had had an important support in Ezzelino da Romano till his fall in 1259. Urban now offered Sicily, as the English financial resources began to be exhausted, to the brother of S. Lewis, CHARLES of Anjou, who by his marriage was heir of Provence, in order through him to destroy the hated Manfred, and at his request the French clergy granted Charles a tithe for three years. His successor CLEMENT IV. caused the crusade to be preached against Manfred.² Charles appeared in Rome, was crowned by Clement and overcame Manfred in the battle at Benevento, where the latter fell (1266). But the Pope had immediately cause to fear the cruel Charles who was also faithless to the Pope. The young CONRADIN appeared in Italy, hailed as a deliverer, but was pursued by the Pope with the ancient hatred against the Hohenstaufen, and laid under the ban, and overcome by Charles in the battle of Tagliacozzo on the 23rd August, 1268, taken prisoner and executed after a form of trial on the 29th October. The hated seed was exterminated, but Germany was most deeply unsettled, and Italy in French hands, which was a cause of apprehension to the Pope himself. And all these conflicts took place in a time during which the **Mongols** rolled on against Germany, the Latin Empire had found its end in Michael Palaeologus in 1261, and Palestine, oppressed by the **Chowaresmians** in the service of the Egyptian Sultan, in greater part, including Jerusalem, fell into their hands.

LEWIS IX., the Saint, indeed once more agreed, in spite of the increasing

¹ POTTHAST, Nr. 16, 406.

² The bull of 2nd Nov., 1265 (POTTHAST, 19, 429), promises all actual participants full indulgence for their sins and addition of eternal salvation on the day of the judgment of the just.

opposition of the opinion of the time, to go forth to the crusade (the so-called **sixth**). The conquest of Damietta succeeded in 1249, but the enterprise ended with Lewis's imprisonment, from which he only returned in 1254 with a small remnant of his force. In this age of disturbance and a great cooling of ecclesiastical enthusiasm, Lewis still stands out as a personality, peculiarly ecclesiastical and monastic in his piety and yet princely.¹ In Syria the Sultan of Egypt more and more limited the points occupied by the Christians; Antioch fell in 1268, so that Ptolemais almost alone remained in Christian hands.

8. The Papacy till the death of Boniface VIII.²

Sources: Besides the Regests of POTTHAST, the new French enterprise: M. PRON, *les registres d'Honorius IV.*, Paris 1886; LANGLOIS, *les reg. de Nicol. IV.*, 1880; DIGARD, FAUCON, THOMAS, *les reg. de Bonif. VIII.*, 1884 sqq. The *vite*, especially those drawn from BERNARD. GUIDONIS, in MURATORI, *scriptt. rer. ital.*, III.; PTOLEMEUS (Bartholomæus) LUCENSIS *histor. eccles.* Muratori XI.; MARTINUS, Polon., *continuatio pontific. Rom.* in MGS., XXII. and the *vite pontific. Rom.* erroneously ascribed to THEODORICUS de NIEM in ECCARD, *Corpus hist. med. ævi*, I., 1462.—*Literature:* W. DRUMANN, *Bonifat. VIII.*, 2 vols., Königsberg 1853; F. E. KOPP, *Wiederherstellung und Verfall des h. röm. Reiches*, continued by BUSSON and others, 5 vols., Basel 1871-83.

After a vacancy of the see of almost three years (29th November, 1268-1st September, 1271) there ensued, on the basis of a compromise, the election, by a small commission of cardinals of both parties, of the Archdeacon of the church of Liège, THEDALD of Piacenza, who ascended the papal chair as GREGORY X. At the time of his election he happened to be in the Holy Land with Prince Edward of England, whither he had been called by Saint Lewis, when he once more took the cross in company with Prince Edward. Lewis himself had died in the undertaking against Tunis, Edward then sought to defend Ptolemais, the last bulwark. With the vow not to forget the Holy Land, Gregory left Palestine and arrived at Rome on the 1st January, 1272. At the **General Council** of 1275, which was again held at Lyons, Gregory sought with very little success to raise recruits for the Holy Land. How much the enthusiasm for it had died out and the opinions had increased, which were already raised even against the **justification** of such crusades, is shown by the remarkable treatise by the General of the Dominicans, HUMBERTUS de Romanis,³ on the subjects to be

¹ On the so-called Pragmatic Sanction of 1269, *vid. infra*, Chap. II., Section 3, under No. 7.

² Gregory X. 1271-76; Innocent V.; Hadrian V.; John XXI.; Nicholas III. 1277-80; Martin IV. 1281-85; Honorius IV. 1285-87; Nicholas IV. 1288-92; Celestine V. 1294; Boniface VIII. 1294-1303.

³ *Vid.* the treatise in BROWN, *Appendix ad fasciculum rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum*, Lond. 1690.

treated of at the Council, which exhaustively seeks to refute the scruples against the justification. The experiences of recent times had occasioned the ordinance which was meant to promote the **acceleration of the papal election**: the election was to be held at the place where the Pope with the Curia had resided and died; after the arrival of the absent cardinals had been awaited for ten days, the shutting up of the cardinals in the so-called **Conclave** was to take place, in order to compel union of parties by gradual diminution of food.¹ The succeeding Popes did indeed suspend this ordinance, to which the cardinals had already shown great resistance at the council. But Celestine V. re-established it.

In Germany, where the disturbances of recent times since the death of Frederick II. had decidedly promoted the influence of the Pope, after the death of Richard of Cornwall, Gregory prompted the new choice of the princes, which fell on RUDOLPH OF HABSBURG (1270-91). The Pope confirmed it (26th September, 1274),² and after Rudolph's ambassadors had sworn at Lyons for their master the oath which had been usual since the time of Otto IV., Rudolph repeated it personally at **Lausanne**, where he met the Pope returning from the Council, who now compelled Alphonzo of Castile to give up the claims he had hitherto made. Rudolph confined himself to the establishment of an ordered condition of affairs in Germany and readily conceded the papal demands in regard to considerable debated portions of the territory in Italy; these now remained definitely to the State of the Church. In face of CHARLES of Anjou who now menaced the Pope, a more friendly *rapprochement* took place between the Pope and the Emperor. Nicholas III. compelled Charles to renounce the claims on the imperial vicariate in Tuscany and on the senatorial dignity in Rome, and established a peace, in which Charles agreed to receive Provence as a fief of the Empire. The pressure of the French rule had long been grievously felt in Lower Italy, and Nicholas III. had already entered into conspiracies against Charles. His successor MARTIN IV., did indeed entirely belong to the French party, but just in his time the hatred of the Sicilians found vent in the **Sicilian Vespers** (30th March, 1282). The Sicilians, after the Pope had rejected with anathema the crown which was offered him, took for king PETER III. of Aragon (the son-in-law of Manfred and so heir of the Hohenstaufen). He and his son James

¹ MANSI, 24, 81. An attempt at similar regulations had already been made before the election of Innocent IV.

² *Vid.* POTTHAST, 20, 929.

asserted themselves over Sicily and Aragon in spite of ban and interdict, and Charles I. of Anjou remained limited to Naples, in which he was succeeded by Charles II. in 1288. For the support of Charles I., Martin IV. did not hesitate to make use of great sums out of the tithes intended for the Holy Land. Soon thereafter Ptolemais also fell in 1291. The political intrigues of the different parties finally brought the pious hermit PETRUS DE MURONE to the papal throne as CELESTINE V., as a harmless instrument of which each party hoped to be able to make use. BENEDICTUS GAËTANI (Cajetan) was specially active in this, being unable at the time to carry his own election on account of his attitude at that time towards Charles II. of Naples. CELESTINE, pious and strict of life, but not fit for his position and entirely under the influence of Charles, was then induced to abdicate by Cardinal Gaëtani, who was skilful enough to come to an understanding with Charles's party.

Gaëtani now succeeded as BONIFACE VIII. Bold, crafty, expert in law and completely acquainted with the affairs of the Curia, but without the ardour of hierarchical natures of a better stamp, he sought once more to raise the papacy to its highest altitude and indeed by mingling in the secular affairs of his time. He detained the abdicated Celestine V., in order not to permit him to become the instrument of his opponents. When he slipped away, Charles caused him to be again arrested by his bailiffs, and Boniface held him prisoner till his death in 1269.¹

In Germany Rudolph's powerful government had been succeeded by the reign of Adolphus of Nassau, who assured the Pope of his childlike obedience, but did not allow himself to be interrupted in his political conflicts by the Pope. PHILIP the Fair of France, a prince who strove by every means after absolute power and the breaking of the opposition of the nobility and higher clergy, and who was solely intent on his own interest, was at war with EDWARD I. of England. The Pope sought by means of his legates, who were armed with the most extensive powers to release oaths, abolish treaties, etc., to put himself forward as arbiter in this conflict; which Philip rejected.

But the complaints of the clergy of France and England of the taxation of the Church and clergy for military purposes gave opportunity to Boniface to forbid the extraordinary taxation of the clergy on pain of excommunication, in the bull **Clericus laicos** of 1296² (a severer form of a previous prohibition of Innocent III.). Philip revenged himself by the prohibition of the export of gold and silver (in reference to the Roman revenues), and answered the complaints

¹ A groundless rumour especial'y among the Celestinian hermits accused Boniface of poisoning him.

² POTTHAST. 24, 291.

of the Pope by allusion to the duties of the clergy also to the commonwealth. The petitions of the Archbishop of Rheims to the Pope showed him that the French clergy would not dare to take his side, and the legates themselves only ventured timidly to fulfil Boniface's attempt to enforce peace upon the conflicting rulers by threats of excommunication. PHILIP answered plainly that no one had the right to interfere with him in secular government.

Hence the Pope abolished the above ordinance by modifying the interpretation of it and sought to appease the king by granting the tithes of the French clergy for three years, and he also canonized his ancestor Lewis IX. The Kings of England and France now actually submitted to the Pope as mediator of peace and arbiter, but only as a private person. But when the Pope immediately furnished his decision given in this capacity with papal sanction by a bull,¹ the negotiations for peace remained fruitless and the mutual reproaches again increased.

The Pope complained especially of the extended application of the **royal prerogative** on the part of Philip. Boniface experienced a grievous rebuff from England, when he laid claim to **Scotland**, which had been subjected by EDWARD, as a papal fief and summoned Edward before his tribunal for offering it violence. In this matter the Parliament stood entirely on the king's side. But PHILIP now sheltered the Ghibelline COLONNAS, who being banished by Boniface, declared Celestine's abdication illegal, and he concluded an alliance in 1299 with the German king ALBERT I. (1298-1308), who having risen against Adolphus of Nassau, after the latter's defeat and death in the battle at Göllheim, was generally recognised except by the Pope alone. In the full consciousness of his papal power Boniface celebrated in 1300 the **Jubilee**, to which hundreds of thousands came to Rome from all countries. Boniface then sent the Bishop of Pamieres, BERNARD of Saisset, as his legate to Philip, to exhort him to the crusade and to the exclusive application of the tithes raised from the Church to this very purpose. Bernard, a French bishop, who was anything but a *persona grata* with Philip, was sent back by the king, and, when he returned to his bishopric, arrested, accused of high treason and deposed. Then ensued the different papal decrees of the 5th December, 1301,² whereby the prospect was held out of the abolition of all the alleged ecclesiastical privileges of the king, the king was exhorted to bear in mind the superiority of the Pope, and the French clergy were invited to an assembly³ at Rome in order to find a decision on the many complaints against Philip. Here and in the bull *Unam Sanctam* there is attachment to Innocent III., *Reg. VII.*, 42.

In the bull **Ausculat fli** it was represented to the king that God had placed the Pope over kings and kingdoms: "let not thyself be

¹ Bull of 30th June, 1298, in POTTHAST, 24,713.

² POTTHAST, 25,096 sqq.

³ *Vid.* the acts in BULÆUS, *Historia universitatis Parisiensis*, Vol. IV. Especially remarkable is the speech of the Cardinal of Porto, Matthæus de Aquasparta.

persuaded, that thou hast no superior over thee and that thou dost not stand under the highest hierarchy; this were madness, and he who stubbornly asserted it would prove himself an unbeliever.”¹ The King’s rude answer declares everyone a fool who does not believe that in secular affairs the King of France is subject to no one. He most decidedly asserts his royal prerogative and supports himself upon his estates, barons, prelates and also cities which repudiate the assumptions of Rome. The French clergy also warned the Pope against extreme measures. The cardinals, as also the Pope himself, disavowed that the Pope desired to regard the French crown as a papal fief. But even the secular jurisdiction, it was said, fell under the spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope in virtue of the spiritual power of the keys “*ratione peccati*,” and indeed *de jure*, though not “*quantum ad usum et ad executionem actus*.” But the Pope now himself answered with the **notorious bull Unam Sanctam** (18th November, 1302);² both swords are in the power of the one head of the Church; it is true that the one, the secular, is according to the expression of Bernard of Clairvaux not to be directly borne **by** the Church itself, but **for** it; but it is subordinate to the spiritual sword, hence to be judged by it, while the highest spiritual power can be judged by no man. He who resists this power, resists God’s ordinance; **hence on pain of forfeiture of salvation every creature must be obedient to the Pope.** While Philip now sought to strengthen his position by peace with England, the Pope was reconciled to Frederick of Sicily (the brother of James) who accepted Sicily as a fief from the Pope, dropped the opposition to Albert I. of Germany, and now exalted the German emperorship, which had been transferred by the Pope from the Greeks to the Germans, as the crown from which all other secular powers on earth received their light, the power, to which all kings and princes were *de jure* subordinated.³

¹ The short and strongest letter “*Deum time*” with the words: “*Scire te volumus, quod in spiritualibus et temporalibus nobis subes . . . ; aliud credentes hæreticos reputamus*” is probably to be regarded as forged although the answer of the king seems to make reference to it. One is inclined to regard it as the letter substituted for the immediately burned papal bull *Ausculta fili*. BERCHTHOLD again maintains its genuineness, *Die Bulle Unam sanctam, ihre wahre Bedeutung und Tragweite für Staat und Kirche*, München 1887.

² POTTHAST, 25,189. The repeatedly printed text is also in L. RICHTER’S edition of the *Corpus juris canonici*, II. 1159; the essentials also in GIESELER, II. 2, p. 203.

³ *Vid.* the remarkable speech in PETRUS DE MARCA, *de concordantia sacerdotii et imperii*, II. 4, 103 sqq. ed BÖHMER. On the report that Boniface had offered Albert the French crown as vacant, *vid.* DRUMANN, *Bon. VIII.*, II. 101.

Albert acknowledged that kings and emperors had received the *otestas temporalis gladii* from the Apostolic See, and took a very comprehensive oath to the Pope, but did not allow himself to be used in the conflict against Philip. Through William Du PLESSIS, Philip, (June, 1303) before a select assembly of French clergy, barons and jurists, now accused the Pope of obtaining his dignity surreptitiously and complained of his procedure against France, and besides accused him of unbelief and all sorts of infamous actions, such as the Pope was accused of by his Italian enemies, for the most part probably unjustly. **Appeal was here made to a general council to be summoned and the future legitimate Pope.** All classes, including the Corporation of the University, the prelates and the monasteries, joined in this appeal. **It was the unanimous voice of the national consciousness now grown strong, against the papal arrogance.** From Anagni Boniface now issued interdict against the country, suspension against the clergy of France, and took away the privileges of the University.¹ The bull of deposition against Philip, whereby France was awarded to the German king, was already prepared, when the French Chancellor, WILLIAM of Nogaret along with Sciarra Colonna surprised the Pope in Anagni and took him prisoner. The people indeed set him free after a few days, but soon thereafter Boniface died of a burning fever. On these controversies, which on the one side show the culmination of the papal claims to world-empire, on the other awakened more acute investigations into the limits of papal power and its demarcation from the secular; *vid. infra*.

¹ *Vid.* POTTHAST, 25,277 sqq.

CHAPTER SECOND.

The Constitution of the Church.

Literature: J. PLANK, *Gesch. der christl.-kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung*, IV. 1 and 2, Hannov. 1806. 7 and the statements of Ecclesiastical Law, especially the text-books of A. L. RICHTER, 8th ed., of R. W. DOVE and W. KAHL, Leipz. 1877; E. FRIEDBERG, 3rd ed. 1889; P. HINSCHIUS, *d. KR. der Kath. u. Prot.*, 4 vols., 1869 sqq.

1. The Canonical Law-Books.

Literature: *vid.* J. F. v. SCHULTE, *Lehrbuch des kath. KR.*, 4th ed. 1886 (Vol. I. 2nd Section); Id., *Geschichte der Quellen des KR.*'s, Vol. I. 1875. The numerous editions of the *Corpus iuris canonici*, *vid.* I. 20, under c).

THE old foundations of the canon law, taken over from the Roman Church of the Empire, had been gradually overgrown and broken through since the beginning of the Germanic Western development, by masses of new ecclesiastico-legal material, which were already gathered together in the previous period in various collections, among which the two books *de synodalibus causis* (p. 219), of Abbot REGINO of Prüm and the *Collectarium* or *decretum* (Ml. 140) of Bishop Burchard of Worms (about 1015) are the best known. In the present period DEUSEDIT, *Collectio Canonum*,¹ composed about 1086, and the two works *Decretum* and *Pannormia* (Ml. 161), ascribed to Bishop IVO of Chartres († 1117), are especially to be named. Old and new materials of ecclesiastical law are mingled in these collections. But the work of the Benedictine or Camaldolite monk in Bologna, GRATIAN (*Concordantia discordantium canonum libri tres*), composed about 1150 (usually called the *Decretum Gratiani*), became of special importance. It is not only a collection of sources, but at the same time a theoretico-practical work; to a running, brief, theoretical disquisition by Gratian himself (*dicta Gratiani*) the particular passages from the sources are subjoined as proofs. The object is a perspicuous arrangement of the valid legal materials and the adjustment of the numerous contradictions by the distinction of particular and general, spiritual and secular, principles of law. The work soon attained great authority and indeed became the foundation for the study of canon law. Through it there properly first

¹ Ed. PIUS MARTINUCCI, Venetiis 1869 (Ml. 150).

arose a special science of ecclesiastical law, while hitherto the matters of ecclesiastical law had formed a part of theology, viz. the *theologia practica externa*, distinguished from dogmatics and morals as the *interna*. The increasing mass of legal relationships which were in themselves purely secular or likewise secular, the transformation of many legal relationships by the Church, and at the same time the influence of Roman law appearing as a model, led to a treatment of ecclesiastical principles of law entirely after the model of modern jurisprudence, and there was thus formed a canonical science in distinction from the theological which led to a great formal completion of the canon law. Now, however, the period after Gratian, from the second half of the eleventh to the beginning of the thirteenth century became just the most fruitful period for the papal legislation by the establishment of the general councils (II. to the IV. Lateran Councils) and the extraordinary increase in the number of the papal decretals (especially by Alexander III. and Innocent III.). These "*Decretales extravagantes*" were gathered together again in collections, e.g. in the so-called *Compilationes antiquæ*. GREGORY IX. then caused his penitentiary RAYMUNDUS DE PENNAFORTE to gather the constitutions and decretals into an official collection in five books, which henceforward was to be used exclusively in *judiciis et scholis*.¹ To it were next attached as additional matter the decretals of Innocent IV. and other popes, which were also usually attached to the decretals of Gregory IX. as *novellæ constitutiones*. From them and the constitutions proper BONIFACE VIII. caused the so-called **liber sextus** to be composed and presented to the Universities of Bologna and Paris.² In addition to these came those of CLEMENT V. from the decisions of the **Council of Vienna** with the addition of a few others: the so-called **Clementines**. As to the still later so-called **extravangantes**, *vid. infra*. In this greatly swollen bulk of ecclesiastico-legal matter great confusion arose. Complaint is made partly of incompleteness, partly of falsification and interpolation, as is already done by Innocent III. His younger contemporary Stephen of Tournay, although himself a decided champion of the new papal law, censures the fact that in canonical judicial procedure an *inextricabilis silva epistolarum* was brought forward and in contrast with it the ancient ecclesiastical canons were neglected.

¹ Bull of 12th September, 1234.

² Bull *Sacrosancta Romana ecclesia* of 1298.

2. The Rights of the Pope.

The ecclesiastico-legal development of the papacy not only brought along with it a general enhancement of the papal power, but also an essential transformation of the fundamental conception. The presupposition of the essentially equal foundation of the papacy with the whole episcopate which was maintained in ancient ecclesiastical law in spite of all the preferences and rights to honour which were awarded to the Pope, can no longer be maintained.

The Pope has long been designated *Episcopus universalis* and *vicarius S. Petri*, and pretty early, on one occasion at the Roman Synod of 495, even *Vicarius Christi*; but from what was there expressed in the customary hyperbolic fashion in the concluding acclamations there were now drawn quite other ecclesiastico-legal inferences which already find a brief and comprehensive expression under Gregory VII. in the so-called *dictatus papæ*.¹ The Pope as *Vicarius Dei* or *Christi*, but not by any means the episcopate united under the Pope, would now be the concentration of all the divine authority of the Church, the proper source of ecclesiastical power and ecclesiastical law. Hence the bishops are in theory pushed back into the position of *vicars* of the Pope, who cannot everywhere directly exercise his absolutely universal power over the whole Church and all believers, and hence calls in the bishops to share in the duties which are incumbent upon him or commissions then with the latter.² It is the Pope who distributes the burden of the pastoral obligations among his brethren, the co-bishops, but in doing so has deprived himself of nothing, so that he can himself interfere in every detail, can himself everywhere investigate, and in certain circumstances can himself judge. The Thomist theory then develops the relation of the *spiritualis potestas* of the bishops to the full papal *potestas*, by drawing a parallel between it and the dependence of every created power on the divine, and between it and that of the pro-consul under the Emperor, while on the other hand it regards the dependence of the *bishop* on the *archbishop* as merely limited, because both have their common root in the supreme *potestas* of the Pope. It is specially significant, that Innocent II., at the opening of the Second Lateran Council in 1139, conceives the relations of the bishops to the Pope after the analogy of the feudal relation.³

The Pope now appears more and more as the **proper source of ecclesiastical law** in so far as he lays more and more exclusive claim to the **legislative power** in the Church.

Gregory VII. already ascribes to him the power of giving new and abrogating old laws. In complete agreement with him Urban II. ⁴ only makes the limitation, that he holds this power in every case in which the gospels and prophets

¹ In JAFFÉ, BrG. II. (Mon. Greg.), p. 175: "*quid valeant pontifices Romani*."

² *Vid.* Innocent III. Epist. l. I. 495 and 496: *in partem sollicitudinis advocavit, ut sic tanti onus officii per subsidiarias actiones commodius supportetur*.

³ MANSI, XXI. 534.

⁴ So likewise judges Johannes Saresberiensis, *vid.* REUTER, *Alexander III.*, 428.

have not given other definite regulations (*sententialiter aliquid definierunt*), a limitation which is again abolished by Thomas Aquinas in so far as the Pope is only bound by the definitions of the fathers and even the apostles so far as they are declared to be valid as *de jure divino*. All others, which are only valid *de jure positivo*, the Pope can alter or give dispensation from; in other words, only what is an article of faith or valid as a divine ordinance *de jure nature*, is withdrawn from his determination. The phrase of Lucas Tudensis, *adv. Albigenses*, II. 1 (Biblioth. Patr. Max. 25, 215) "*in scrinio cuius* (scil. *papæ*) *pectoris totius iuris summa consistit*," here used in the sense of the absolutely unlimited power to bind and to loose according to his will, is subsequently adopted by Boniface VIII. (Sexti liber I. 2, cap. 1), certainly only in order to afford foundation for the principle that by a new constitution of the Pope a previous silence is already reprobated. But this always involves that the Pope as unlimited and sovereign lord has the power of legislation.¹ In Gratian's Decretum the view was still preponderantly asserted, that the Pope had not the authority to ordain one-sided alterations in the precepts of earlier councils; on the other hand power to abolish by his own authority all positive legal precepts, and therefore the earlier councils also, was now ascribed to him. **The Councils were hence to be valid only under papal authority and when brought about by it.** A limitation of the legislative authority of the Pope by the councils is already called in question by Paschal II., because they came into existence and received power by the authority of the Roman Church. Hence also the Pope is not bound by their ordinances. Hence, from the time of the Third Lateran Council, it is also usual to publish their ordinances only **in the name of the Pope** with the addition "*sacro adprobante* or *præsente concilio*." Connected with this is the controversial question as to what was to be held in case of a quarrel between the Pope and the council. The doctrine of the Curia, as it is represented by THOMAS also, gives the decisive voice to the Pope even without a council, but the doctrine of the episcopate gives it to the council even without the Pope. This was a controversial question which in the following period became a burning one. Connected with it is the definite assertion, that the Pope who has to adjudicate on everything, is himself to be judged by none, not even by a general council. Sound ecclesiastical and papal opinions, such as that of GERHON of Reichersberg do indeed complain even in the time of Alexander III., that Rome will not suffer itself in any way to be called to account or allow any one to ask *cur ita facis*, and emphasize the fact that the Pope is subject to the Church, and therefore also to a general representation of it,² but the Pope tenaciously asserts the above principle, e.g. on the occasion of the Synod of Pavia (p. 270).

As master of the laws the Pope can also grant dispensation from ecclesiastical laws (*de jure supra ius dispensare*, Innocent III. Decr. Greg. III., T. 8, c. 4), and indeed in a very extensive manner.

The earlier dispensations, such as the bishops had also power to grant, merely referred to violations of ecclesiastical laws which had taken place, but that to which the Pope now laid claim also referred to deviation from the canons (*venia canones infringendi*) to be permitted beforehand, only here also the sound

¹ This "rule of interpretation" is therefore not of such harmless import as is represented in the *Katholik* of 1888, p. 479.

² *Vid.* REUTER, *Alexander III.*, 3, 518.

papal Thomist doctrine finds itself compelled to limit this authority to ecclesiastical ordinances, which were *juris humani* or *positivi*, and therefore to the exclusion of what was *juris divini* or *naturalis*; but the glossators of the canon law take pleasure in extending to the furthest possible extent the Pope's right of dispensation.

In logical connection with the assertion of the absolute ecclesiastical *potestas* the conception of **papal infallibility** now begins to be formed.

At first, as with Gregory VII., it is in the mild form of belief in the promise of Christ (Luke xxii. 32), and with reference to the alleged fact that no heretic had ever sat in the Roman chair,¹ and so that none would ever sit in it; thus Alexander III., with every confession of human fallibility in affairs of ecclesiastical administration, also assumes infallibility in matters of belief,² and Innocent III. says: "if I were not firm in the faith, how could I educate others in the faith, which, however, is my vocation." However, the case is supposed as at least possible, that the individual Pope should err from the true faith and in such case be corrected by the Church, and so Innocent says further, that the Pope is to be judged by no man, *nisi deprehendatur a fide devius*.

Linking on to the custom which required the metropolitans, before receiving the pallium as the sign of union with the Roman see, to make a confession of faith and take a vow to maintain the Roman decretals, the popes began to chain the higher hierarchy to themselves by **sworn obligation**.

The **oath of fealty** formed on the model of the feudal oath, and imposed by Gregory VII. on the **metropolitans**, was regularly used from the twelfth century and strengthened according to circumstances. On the strength of this oath popes also required obedience in political affairs. Gregory VII. also desired that the metropolitans should come in person for the pallium to Rome, which however was not carried out. Encroaching upon the rights of the metropolitans, the popes also sought to ally themselves directly with the bishops. By custom, indeed, the bishops rendered the oath of subjection to their metropolitans, by whom they were consecrated, but the **confirmation** and **consecration** of bishops now begins to be **reserved** to the Pope; it then becomes the rule that the bishops are bound to render the oath into the hands of the bishop delegated by the Pope for the purpose of consecration. Corresponding to this is the fact that along with the bestowal of the pallium upon the metropolitans, there is then for the first time expressly conferred upon them the right to consecrate bishops. On the other hand the bishops, for the sake of securing their position, frequently sought confirmation directly in Rome, naturally not with empty hands.

But the popes already also laid claim now and again to the right of **nominating the bishops themselves**; such bishops are designated *dei et apostolicæ sedis gratia episcopus*. So likewise the right to

¹ *Vid.* Gregorii VII. dictatus, whose freedom from error is ascribed to the Roman Church.

² REUTER, l.c. 3, 511.

remove and depose bishops is decidedly claimed by the popes. The vassal oath is also frequently required of bishops and exempted abbots as well as from the metropolitans.

Of the most far reaching consequences was further the claim, based on the Pseudo-Isidore, to the **universal right** of receiving appeals not only **after** trial before the episcopal tribunal, but also **before** it.

According to Alexander III. all legal proceedings may be directly instituted before the Pope, or rather, his legate. In this connection appeal begins to be desired *a civili iudice* to the Pope, which serious ecclesiastical opinions, as already Bernard of Clairvaux, disapprove, on account of the disturbing consequences for ecclesiastical and civil order, which emerge so much the more tangibly as the Curia now claims a **universal right of absolution**, i.e. the right of direct decision by the Pope, who, formerly, on the occurrence of an appeal, only sent the matters back for renewal investigation. Scrupulous bishops essentially contributed to this momentous extension of the right of appeal, by referring every dubious or hard case from themselves to the Pope.

Those cases which the Pope on all occasions reserved to his own decision as grave (*Causa Papæ reservati*) increase to an extraordinary extent in the course of time; so likewise the **cases of dispensation** reserved to the Pope. The right of **canonization** is now also expressly made a reserved right of the popes by Alexander III. Innocent III. expanded this right by extending it to the acknowledgment of relics.

Of specially momentous consequences was the claim of the popes to dispose of ecclesiastical benefices in the different national churches.

In the twelfth century they (Innocent II. and others) begin to issue letters of recommendation to episcopal chapters to provide favoured clerics with prebends. This influence, exercised in the form of recommendation and petition (*preces*),¹ then assumed the form of legal disposition: the recommendation becomes a **monitorium**, eventually a **mandate**, on which finally execution follows. In the thirteenth century this papal disposition over benefices is already enormously increased, hence the popes also again secure particular ecclesiastical foundations against it by means of indulgence or give the concession that no foundation may be burdened by the particular pope with more than four mandates.² From this there is further developed the legal conception of **papal reservation**; on the ground of their right of disposition over all ecclesiastical offices the popes lay claim to the filling up of **all benefices becoming vacant in Curia**. So again by the so-called **right of devolution** the filling up of bishoprics is claimed by the Pope, when the election which has been carried out by those entitled is rejected as illegal, and (Innocent III.)

¹ Corresponding to this in the secular sphere is the *jus primæ precis* which fell to the Emperor. Of Innocent III., *Epist.* vii. 70.

² Cf. RICHTER-DÖRE-KAHL, *Kirchenrecht*, p. 702.

when the election has been delayed beyond three months. But finally the popes also laid claim in special cases to the right of **taxing ecclesiastical property**, especially in the form of conceding to provinces the levying of an ecclesiastical tenth for a definite period for the purpose of the crusade.

The proper organs of this enormous papal power were the **legates** (the **legati ordinarii**, or rather **legati a latere**).

The ancient Church had known such ambassadors and substitutes of the Pope, *e.g.* at the general councils, or as permanent representatives and agents, such as the apocrisaries in Constantinople, so also emissaries with definite full power for certain affairs. In another fashion certain metropolitans had been entrusted as papal vicars with higher rights of supervision over a larger ecclesiastical circle (*vid.* the vicars of Arles and of Thessalonica, vol. i. 344, and the position destined for Bishop Drogo, ii., 157). The Pseudo-Isidore had advocated the idea of such a primacy as a permanent intermediate degree. Besides, as a rule the case of such primatial rank was accompanied by the notion of a legation, *i.e.* a commission to represent definite papal rights. Now, however, the *legati ordinarii* emerge as an indispensable institution. They exercise the so-called **concurrent jurisdiction** of the Pope, *i.e.* the right appertaining to the Pope of interfering everywhere in the jurisdiction of the bishops; and when they are at the same time cardinals, they have at the same time as **legati a latere** the power to exercise the reserved papal rights, with some exceptions. On the other hand the position of the vicars or permanent legates rather sank into a mere honorary precedence, the limited rights of which became inoperative in the presence of an ordinary legate. The princes only claimed with fluctuating success to make the appearance of these ordinary legates in their territories dependent on their consent. These legates, equipped with universal full powers *ad visitandas ecclesias*, frequently appointed from the time of Leo IX. and especially from that of Gregory VII., have precedence over all bishops without regard to their own ecclesiastical rank. From this *legatio* there is, for the rest, to be distinguished the **delegatio**, *i.e.* that of the transference of jurisdiction on the part of the *judices ordinarii* with a definitely limited commission which might not be transgressed. Thus the Pope, as *ordinarius iudex singulorum*, sends papal delegates, who may even force the bishops as ordinaries to carry out the decision approved by them by the application of censures. As those ordinary legates are entitled to claim sustenance from the churches in which they are active, they frequently practise the **greatest monetary exactions**, and contribute in quite special measure to increase the complaints as to papal oppression in regard to finance, such as are most sharply expressed by men of sound papal disposition such as Bernard, John of Salisbury, and many others.

Naturally, with the growth of the papal claims, a **numerous papal Curia** is also made necessary. The name occurs from about the middle of the eleventh century for the officials surrounding the Pope, and Gerhoh of Reichersberg still censures this secular expression. Naturally, growing financial resources were also required for it, which were claimed by the popes under various titles.

The Papal See draws revenues partly from the landed properties bestowed by the Roman Church, partly from the monasteries which have submitted to its

protection or have been placed from the beginning under it by their founders, partly from the so-called exempted bishoprics, partly taxes from secular rulers in consequence of the feudality of their realms. Individual nations such as England, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, rendered taxes to it under special titles, such as the so-called Peter's penny. Other revenues may be designated according to their nature, as **dues**. Thus according to the law of Justinian definite dues were paid by the ordained to the ordaining patriarchs, archbishops or bishops, and their chanceries, which among the lower clergy rose as high as the value of a year's income. The like was found in the Roman Church also in the sixth century.¹ Later also a so-called **Oblatio** or **Benedictio** was there rendered by consecrated bishops or ordained abbots. Since the right of ordaining or confirming bishops had now become a papal reservation, this gave rise to a very lucrative source of income; this was likewise the case with the bestowal of the **pallia** on the metropolitans, for which a considerable tax had to be paid, which had already given cause of complaint in the time of Boniface, and again since the eleventh century. But finally a rich source of income arose out of the right above mentioned of taxing ecclesiastical property or tithing all ecclesiastical revenue, to which the popes laid claim in extraordinary cases. Hence the incessant complaint as to Roman avarice advances step by step with the rise of the papal power. While so-called simony is combated with holy zeal, in Rome and among the papal legates it prevails in another form and in unlimited fashion. When the Roman legate, Richard, reproached Ivo, Bishop of Chartres, with the fact that simony still prevailed in his diocese, Ivo declared: if according to ancient custom the dean or cantor and other members of the chapter demand money from the canons to be appointed, they appeal against my opposition to the example of the Roman Church, where the chamberlains and ministers of the palace require much of the consecrated bishops and abbots under the title of the Oblatio or the Beneficium; not even pen and paper are to be had there otherwise. Archbishop Adalbert of Mayence as papal legate required of a new bishop as the price of recognition 300 pounds for the Pope and 600 for himself (cf. WOKER, *Kirchliches Finanzwesen der Päpste*, Nördlingen 1878).

3. The relation of the papal Church to the secular power and the geographical extension of the papal church-government.

Literature: E. FRIEDBERG, *de finium inter ecclesiam et civitatem regundorum iudicio, quid mediæ ævi doctores et leges statuerint*, Leipz. 1861. Id. in ZKR. VIII.

1. At the beginning of the former period Charlemagne had put himself forward as ruler of Christendom, on whom fell first and foremost the care for the maintenance of the faith and the practical Christian education of the people. He had also regarded the administration of ecclesiastical order and the maintenance of the faith taught by the Church as his task. Accordingly, the assemblies of the Empire, formed of spiritual and secular representatives, had afforded a handle for ecclesiastical legislation also. On the one hand honour

¹ *Vid.* Concilium Romanum, 595, also contained in the Decretum Gratianum, Cap. 4, Caus. 1. quæst. 2.

and acknowledgment were paid to the organs of the Church and also to the head of the Church as the guardian of religious-moral truth, but on the other hand the ecclesiastical institutions with their property were unhesitatingly drawn into the service of political civilization and the secular requirements of the State.

2. The strengthened specifically ecclesiastical consciousness had next obtained its rough expression in the Pseudo-Isidore, and the strong character of the personality of Nicholas I. had asserted the Church, culminating in the papacy, as the highest religious-moral authority even as against the secular princes, and had striven after the Church's free self-determination.

3. But the papacy, which withdrew itself from the supreme power of the Emperor, fell a victim to the self-seeking interests of the parties, which made use of its power for their own purposes and in a high degree divested the Church of its religious-moral ideality. It was the Empire which by taking thought for its own religious-moral duties had first to bring the papacy to order. But in the Church, elevated from its disgrace by the secular power, tendencies towards ecclesiastical reform of a serious character gain increasing power; the Church strives to stand upon its own feet, to go its own way, and to guard itself against being put under the guardianship of the secular power and, for that end strives to gain the dominion of secular affairs. For the Church as a legal institution requires for its spiritual ends universal obedience from the Christian world, the submission of all who desire to have a share in its sacramental graces to its discipline, and the consecration of all profane institutions by the Church. Hence not only the highest **persons** in secular rank must be subject to the judgment and discipline of the Church, but also all secular **orders** are to fall under its spiritual guidance.

4. The far-reaching domination of rude power and the self-seeking interests of political life themselves promote the view, according to which the secular ordinances of life do not appear so much as independently moral, but rather as in themselves profane, and requiring the higher divine influence through the Church, before they can obtain any value. From the representatives of the Church there goes forth the influence which sought not without success to give the world the peace of God in the establishment of the so-called *treuga dei*. But the Church immediately begins to defend itself against simony and to come forward in favour of the celibacy of priests, and indeed not only for the sake of combating the venality of the clergy and establishing their ascetic purity, but also in the interest of a fundamental **severance and emancipation from the**

secular power in general. But the Church can only promise itself effective consequences for these efforts by gathering its power together in the monarchical papacy.

5. In GREGORY VII. the conceptions of ecclesiastical reform and the effort after unlimited papal power consciously prevail. It is no longer the Christian king, but the Pope, who is the head of the great Christian family, and who, as the substitute of God, requires obedience of all its members, even the highest. A supreme dominion over everything secular is also derived here from his universal religious mission.

Peter, it is said, was appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ to be *princeps super regna* (Registrum, i. 63); the Pope holds the *universale regimen* (ibid., ii. 51). Along with Paul, Peter has the power to take the empire, kingdoms, principalities, etc., and every possession from one person and give them to another, according to merit. As he has to give **account** of princes to God, so, as God's representative, it is his to require **obedience** from them. The apostolic and the kingly power ought indeed to co-operate for the guidance of men, but the much used image of the sun and the moon assigns the subordinate place to the kingly power and is obliged to do so logically, as it regards the Pope as the representative of God, and the spiritual power as necessarily called to the guidance of all earthly things. In presence of it every earthly power appears as of profane origin. In spite of the acknowledgment that the secular power also exists in accordance with the divine will, the origination of princely power is derived merely from human pride and human passion inspired by the devil (*Registr.* IV. 2 and VII. 21, especially p. 456 sqq.). Hence Gregory already requires of the new Emperor, to be elected after the death of Rudolph of Rheinfelden, a strict oath of fealty and obedience (*Reg.* VIII. 26, p. 475). The idea that the Pope has no right to depose the Emperor and raise another in his place, he regards as a foolish opinion (*Reg.* VIII. 21; cf. his threats against Philip of France, *Reg.* II. 5).

6. The further prosecution of these tendencies, which already find strong expression in the book of DAMIANI (*de privilegiis Romanæ ecclesiæ*, Opp. III.), prompted by Hildebrand before his accession to the throne, and likewise in the work of Cardinal HUMBERT *adversus Simoniacos*, and which are also gathered together in the so-called *Dictatus* of Gregory (*Reg.* II. 55 a), involved that the election of the Pope, which by the decree of Nicholas II. was placed in the hands of the cardinals, should be rescued from the claims of the Emperor, and involved further the obstinate conflict over investiture, and finally the continued effort to release the Church and clergy from secular **jurisdiction** and secular **burdens**, and substitute the use of spiritual weapons as means of coercion against princes. In doing so the canonical doctrine **at first** still adheres to the independence of both the papal and the imperial power, each in its own sphere, and also does not yet found the imperial dignity upon the

papal investiture, but on the election by the princes and people.¹ But Bernard of Clairvaux already holds that **both swords** belong to the Church, and only that the secular sword is to be administered not *by* the Church itself but only *for* the Church *ad nutum sacerdotis* (*De considerat.* 4, 31).

7. The attempted realisation of the papal universal monarchy appears at its highest point under Innocent III. The Lord is said to have commanded Peter to rule not only the Church, but the whole world also (*Reg.* II. 209). Both powers—that over souls and that over bodies, were indeed created by God, but the one by direct divine ordinance; the other, as is exemplified in Saul's monarchy, was only extorted from God by human desire (*Reg. de negotio*, Nr. 18).

Hence arose the claim (*vid. sup.* p. 275) to decide on the worthiness of the elected German king and make him Emperor by consecration. The Pope actually carries his point as to the oath of fidelity to be rendered by the Emperor. In Constantine's Donation Gregory sees the correct acknowledgment that he to whom God has entrusted the government of heavenly things ought also to rule over the earthly (MG. Ep. s. 13, I. 703). Innocent IV. gives the strongest expression to the like sentiment in his conflict with Frederick II.

Fundamentally it is everywhere the **spiritual power to bind and to loose**, conceived as **spiritual jurisdiction**, which is made to afford the foundation for the judicial superiority of the Pope even over princes; but INNOCENT IV. goes beyond the widest extension of this principle, when he says, that it was not Constantine, but the eternal King and Priest after the fashion of Melchisedec who, along with the high priestly, bestowed also the royal autocracy (*monarchatus*) on Peter and his successors. The converted Constantine, he said, had only given back the dominion of the Church which had hitherto been exercised in an illegitimate manner, in order to receive it again from the Vicar of Christ as it was ordained by God. Both swords rest in the lap of the Church; he who is not in the Church has neither of them; both by right belong to Peter. The saying is not, throw away thy sword, but: put up thy sword in the sheath, all that is meant being that he is not to handle it himself; **the successors of Peter are forbidden to handle the sword themselves, but not the authority in virtue of which it is handled.** The *materialis postestas gladii* lies potentially in the lap of the Church; actually it is transferred by the Church to the Emperor.²

¹ *Vid.* MAASSEN, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der juristischen Literatur*, Wien 1857, p. 67 sqq.

² WINKELMANN, *Acta inedita*, II. 696 sqq.

With the theological theory there are allied other practical considerations of a perfectly different sort, by means of which Innocent IV., in reference to the saying of Frederick II. quoted above, p. 284, seeks to reassure princes in the belief that they have nothing to fear from the Pope such as Frederick II. had. From their prelates, who anointed them, they nevertheless received the feudal oath for their secular fiefs. They reign by hereditary succession, the Emperor by the choice of the German princes.

8. The attempt to assert these claims in the most pointed manner against **Christian princes in general**, is involved in the procedure of Boniface VIII., which has been described.

Distinct from the foundation of the peculiar relation between Pope and Emperor, spiritual and secular power in general, is moreover the attempt, which through historical circumstances was crowned with much success, to bring a large number of European countries into a relation of real dependence on the Pope.

But even apart from this Gregory VII. already obtained a high degree of decisive authority over different princes and kingdoms of his time. Under the banner of S. Peter the Duke of the Normans seized the mastery over England, and the Normans in Southern Italy had to supply him with a point of support against the German Empire. The See of Peter was engaged in lively intercourse¹ with the kingdoms of the Scandinavian North, as well as with the Slavs and Magyars in the East, and being released from the German dominion, they met the papacy with great willingness. It has been narrated what influence the Roman See under Alexander III. attained in England, as also how it interfered under Innocent III. in the political relations of England and France, etc. Various provinces of national churches which had formerly been independent and little touched by the papal power were opened to its influence. The **Spanish Church**, till towards the end of the previous period, had stood almost entirely without connection with Rome under the **Spanish Primacy** which had passed from Toledo to Compostella. But the necessities of the Christian rulers drove them into close attachment to the Christian West; especially under ALPHONZO VI. of Castile, Asturia, Léon, Galicia and a part of Portugal. With him and with SANCHE of Aragon Gregory VII. joined alliance after long separation, and essentially obtained the acceptance of the **Roman liturgy** instead of the Mozarabic. Similarly Alexander III. succeeded in attracting the hitherto almost entirely isolated **Irish Church** which, it is true, according to ancient custom, had procured ordination for its bishops from Canterbury. The action of Archbishop MALACHI of Armagh,² who wrought for the naturalization of the canonical hours, the Roman confession, confirmation and marriage, was especially epoch-making for the beginning of a closer alliance with Rome, under King David (1124-53). At this time there also began the removal of the national married priests—the so-called Culdees—especially in the cathedral churches, though in the meantime it could not be carried to its completion. MALACHI procured the pallium in Rome in 1135, and a synod of 1148 was active in the matter. After Malachi's death Eugene III. sent four pallia to Ireland. Four archbishoprics were erected at the Council of **Mellifont** in 1152. But

¹ Cf. Gregory's *Regest.* I. 13; II. 63 and 70.

² BERNHARDI CLARAVALL. *liber de vita et rebus gestis Malachie* in Opp. ed. MABILLON, I. 657 sqq.; MI. 182, 1013.

ecclesiastical interests here went hand in hand with those of politics directed towards the **subjection of Ireland to England**, supported by Hadrian IV. who was himself an Englishman. In the negotiations carried on on this subject with John of Salisbury in 1155 the Roman See develops the theory, according to which all islands belong to the Papal See¹ *de jure antiquo*, viz. according to the Donation of Constantine. The British ruler receives permission to take possession of Ireland for the purpose of ecclesiastical and moral reforms, without prejudice to the rights of the Church, and under condition of the payment of Peter's penny by every house. King Henry III., after seventeen years, sought to carry out these plans. Alexander III. sent legates, summoned a council, and in doing so treated the Irish as almost mere nominal Christians, who were now for the first time to be Christianized and introduced into the Christian organization. The occupation of Ireland by Henry was followed by the **Synod of Cashel** in November, 1171. But the ecclesiastical arrangements took place without even the mention of Rome. The special ecclesiastical features which were connected with national peculiarities had to give way.

On occasion of the crusades new relations were also formed with the East (*vid. infra*).

The **Milanese Church** now also succeeded in drawing out of its old independence and closer to Rome. Even after the subjection of the Milanese to the Roman requirements of celibacy, the clergy and people of Milan would not have Anselm, the new archbishop, go to Rome. He did indeed do so, but evaded receiving the pallium from the Pope. In the 12th century Milan took part against the Emperor Lothar of Saxony, and in the contemporary papal schism took the part of Anacletus against Innocent II., but for this very cause was obliged to submit to the growing power of Lothar and Pope Innocent II. whom he recognised, and the archbishop was obliged to receive the pallium from the latter and take the oath to him (1136).

Not only were the ideas of the papal universal monarchy, which were so greatly enlarged from Gregory VII. onwards, opposed by the ideas of the imperial supreme authority and the efforts of the princes, but also the conception of the independence of the two powers, the spiritual and the secular, each in its own sphere, as it had been so decidedly asserted by Frederick I. and II., maintained itself for a considerable time after Gregory VII. even in canonist doctrine. Against the encroachments of the papal power, especially against the political and financial oppressions which resulted from their application, there arose a powerful resistance even on the part of those who were well-wishers of the Church. An example in point is the so-called **Pragmatic Sanction**, carried out by so good a churchman as Lewis IX. of France on the ground of the *gravamina ecclesie Gallicanæ*, in which the complaints of the barons and magnates of the realm as to the Papal oppressions were expressed.

Devotion, it said, had been thereby cooled and even transformed into vehement hatred; it was unheard of that the Roman Church should demand subsi-

¹ *Vid.* the bull in Mansi, XXI. 788.

dies or tribute from the Gallican Church for every necessity; unheard of that it should say, "give me so-and-so much or I excommunicate thee." Lewis refused the Pope the tithes demanded from the French Church for three years for the purpose of the war against Frederick II. He would by no means suffer the Church of his kingdom to be plundered in order that by these means war should be made on Christians; he himself indeed, in 1267, got the Pope to concede him these three years' tithes of the French Church, but for the purpose of the crusade, as to which his own clergy were greatly exasperated. To appease them, in **March**, 1269, he issued the so-called **Pragmatic Sanction**.¹ Their full right and jurisdiction are here assured to the prelates, patrons and collators of the French Church, free election by the chapter is asserted and the Roman exactions are forbidden; such levies are only to be permitted by the royal assent, in case of acknowledgment of their inevitable necessity.

That moreover the grave dangers of the Papal encroachments were keenly felt by good churchmen is shown *e.g.* by Gerhoh of Reichersberg, whose sound papal sentiments came into keenly felt discord with his political loyalty in the conflict of Frederick I. with Alexander III.; so likewise in the 13th century Bishop Robert GROSSETESTE (Grossetete, Greathead) of Lincoln († 1253), was impelled by nothing but strenuous zeal for the Church to say the sharpest things to Innocent IV. on account of the encroachments practised by the latter on episcopal rights (Provisions) to the prejudice of pastoral duty.²

4. The Social Relations of the Clergy.

The effort of the Church towards **emancipation** of the spiritual power from the secular and increase of the influence of the spiritual power in the secular sphere stamps itself distinctly on the development of the relations of the clergy in general. Connected with this is:

1. **The elevation of the class-rights of the clergy.** In pursuance of the claims already asserted at an earlier time, the **principle of the inviolability of the clergy** is already enunciated at the Second Lateran Council in 1139, for the protection of the clergy against attacks.³ Every material injury (with a few exceptions) inflicted on them involves the penalty of the Church's ban. Even according to the legislation of the decretals the injurer *ipso facto* falls under excommunication, from which as a rule only the Pope can absolve.

¹ *Ordonnances des rois de France de la troisième race, recueillies par* MS. DE LAURIER, Paris, 1723, fol. I. 97. As to the contested genuineness *vid.* the literature in RICHTER-DOVE, 8th ed., p. 129.

² *Vid.* LECHLER, *Wiclif*, I. 177 sqq.

³ Synod of Würzburg in 1130, can. 10; of Rheims in 1131, can. 9. Second Lateran Synod in 1139, c. 15.

2. The **ancient ecclesiastical privileges**, which had also been essentially transferred to Germanic conditions (*vid. sup.*, p. 104), are especially demanded in reference to the **immunity of the clergy from burdens and taxes** as a privilege bestowed by God, and recognised by the imperial legislation of Frederick II., of 10th November, 1220.

3. In accordance with the principle that no cleric as such shall stand under secular power, and with the point of view which dominates the whole controversy over investiture, the **exemption of the clergy from secular jurisdiction is demanded** in a new fashion from the time of Urban II.

Urban II. already went beyond the principle still acknowledged by Gratian, that the clergy **in civil affairs were subject to civil jurisdiction**, and only in criminal affairs to that of the bishops, and under him the Synod of Nîmes declared it sacrilege to drag clergy or monks before a secular tribunal. Alexander III. threatened this offence with excommunication. According to Innocent III., even in civil matters a cleric was not even to renounce the spiritual jurisdiction in controversy with a layman, since the spiritual court was not a personal beneficium for the individual clergy, but was awarded to the whole class. The attempt of Henry II. of England to re-obtain penal jurisdiction over the clergy by means of the capitula of Clarendon (p. 272) failed. For the case of obstinate persistence in offence, seeing that the Church could only dispose of its spiritual means of punishment, Celestine III. certainly retained the expedient that obstinate clerical criminals should be handed over to the secular penal power, which could proceed by means of exile or other legitimate penalties. It was partly pre-supposed, or expressly ordained by princes, or conceded on the part of the spirituality as a special privilege to the authorities, that the secular judge might **apprehend** a cleric taken *in flagranti*, but only in order to hand him over to the spiritual judge (Synod of Lerida, 1229). The French magnates under Philip Augustus, in 1219,¹ no longer dared to demand that a person who had been degraded by the spiritual tribunal for common crime should be handed over to the secular tribunal, but only that the degraded person should not be protected on the part of the Church from further prosecution by the secular court, and that the secular judge might further seize and judge him outside the church and the forecourt, when he found him. Still more cramping for the secular administration of justice was the principle, that **all who had taken the cross**, were thereby withdrawn from the secular tribunal (*vid. infra*). As regards them, Philip Augustus demanded that in cases of grosser common crime, the penalty of which was death or mutilation, the final judgment should be before the secular tribunal; the Church was not to protect them, in return for which he would leave them to the ecclesiastical forum in the case of lighter transgressions. The principle of the privilege of the spiritual court of justice found confirmation in the legislation of Frederick II. in 1220. And also in his Sicilian code he only excepted crime of high treason from this privilege.

¹ *Vid. GIESELER, II. 2,270.*

4. **The emancipation of the election of bishops from the secular power.** On the abolition of **lay-investiture** a certain influence of princes on the election of bishops very probably remained possible, as, conversely, regard to the properly ecclesiastical and canonical rights of election was still compatible with investiture with ring and staff by laymen. On the whole, however, the movement against investiture by the secular power advanced co-ordinately with that for the abolition of secular influence in general on the election. The position of the clergy in the secular feudal alliance now certainly hindered the radical solution, which sought to bring the bishoprics, etc., entirely into the hands of the Church. The **obligation to the feudal lord**, which was involved in the holding of the fief, necessarily remained, as in the interest of the Church the royalties could not be renounced. The bestowal of the royalties by the secular feudal superior also requires the rendering of the feudal oath and the assumption of the feudal obligations, as was also recognised by Innocent III. at the Fourth Lateran Council, can. 43; similarly the cleric, in spite of the privilege of the spiritual tribunal, was obliged, as a **holder of a royal fief**, to accept law from his feudal superior (Alexander III.). But the share of the laity in the actual **election of a bishop** was greatly diminished, in consequence of the controversy as to investiture. Innocent II. certainly ordained that the chapter should not exclude pious laymen from participation in the election. According to Gerhoh, the clergy have to advise, the canons to elect, the people to pray, and the *honorati* (advowees and noble servitors of the bishop) to approve; nevertheless, when this approval does not ensue, an otherwise canonical election is not to fall to the ground. But the **canonici** (the cathedral chapter), especially from the time of Alexander III., more and more appear as the real and exclusive electoral college; **as the cardinals elect the Pope, so should the cathedral chapter elect the bishop.** So INNOCENT III., in the **Fourth Lateran Council**, places the decision in the entire cathedral chapter or its majority, or even in its better part (*senior pars*), in which case a handle was afforded for the interference of the Pope.

5. **The limitation of the right of patronage** also shows the effort to place the Church on a free and independent footing. If formerly the church was founded and endowed by a landlord, was still regarded as the property of the landlord or his heirs (p. 100), and the landlord or patron as the person who had the right of **appointing** to the pastorate, there is now **no longer** any question of a **property** of the landlord in the pastorate; there now remains to him only

the right of protection and supervision of the church property (hence in the decretals the *patronus* is occasionally also designated *advocatus*). The principle which had already been so frequently inculcated by the Pseudo-Isidorian collection, that no cleric might receive his office as a fief from a layman, now becomes practical in the fact that the landlord's right of nomination is transformed into the **jus præsentandi** attached to the possession of the estate.

But alongside of this so-called **real patronage**, there is developed in the time of Alexander III. the **personal patronage** attached to the foundation, and still further relations of patronage arise out of the investiture of laymen with church property and the institution of **churchwardens**. The so-called **spiritual patronage** rests partly on endowment out of the resources of the **cathedral** or **monastery** entitled, partly on donation on the part of the secular patrons, but it frequently rests on the **right of the incorporation**, the presentation of churches to the monasteries, which have divine service administered by one of their members, or a vicar installed by them. In this case the installation of the minister by the monasteries has also been mostly transformed into presentation, but at the same time such stringent measures were not taken against this influence as against the influence of the laity.

6. The **enormous possessions of the Church** supplied the condition of its vast development of power. The Church as a whole was not indeed regarded as the **propriatrix** of church property, still less were the individual communities, but, according to the predominant canonical point of view, the individual **churches** and **ecclesiastical institutions** are regarded as the proper **holders of the right**. But sufficient provision is made for the undivided utilization of the immense property of the Church through the right of **superintendence** and **control** ascribed to the ecclesiastical superiors under the culmination of the entire hierarchical system in the papacy. Here also the Church seeks with much success to guard the free disposal over church property, and to pursue its constant augmentation by every means, although it is always exposed, in regard to the former, to covetous interference from the secular side; and in regard to the latter, especially towards the end of this period, the need obtrudes itself upon the secular authorities, of placing such limits upon the acquisition of portions of land on the part of the Church, as should arrest the excessive increase of property in the dead hand. This effort begins in particular in the thirteenth century among the cities, which issued their own municipal laws. The secular judges often refuse recognition to those testamentary dispositions by which immoveable property or more than a definite sum of money is bequeathed to the Church. This movement extended more decidedly in the following period.

The secular means of power of the bishops and prelates for the most part rest upon the **secular fiefs** held by them. This feudal relation explains the attempts of the feudal lords to interfere with the usufruct of the property appertaining to the ecclesiastical dignitaries, for their own advantage, especially in cases of death, especially by the so-called *jus regaliæ*, according to which during the time of vacancy the *bona temporalia* and the *jurisdictio temporalis* recurred to the feudal superior, and also the **jus spoli** or **exuviarum**, which developed about the same time, *i.e.* the right of the feudal superior, which probably originally arose out of reckless violent interference, and became a custom, to take possession of the personal property left at the death of prelates.

The former primarily related only to properties **bestowed by the king**. It was not till the thirteenth century that the attempt was made to extend it to all properties of the bishoprics from whatever source they might have proceeded. The **royalty** was claimed in France (for the greater part of the French bishoprics) from the middle of the twelfth century, in England even earlier. As a matter of fact the popes were obliged to acknowledge this right as regards France, and when Boniface VIII. aspired anew to abolish it, Philip the Fair was able to assert it, and indeed with reference to other prebends and dignities also. The claims which were here only tolerated with resistance, had to be given up in Germany by Otto IV. But a general prohibition, to which Frederick II. agreed in 1220, was never observed by the German princes, and equally little by other kings and their great vassals, or the stewards and patrons who laid claim to the right. At the Council of Lyons, in 1274 (can. 12), which guards itself against the robbery of spiritual properties on the part of the stewards, the customary enjoyment of the fruits of the ecclesiastical property in cases where it has existed from antiquity, has to be conceded during the time of vacancy. The *jus primarum prebendam* of the German emperors, *i.e.* the right of the bestowal of one benefice in each bishopric, which was conceded to them, may be regarded as a scanty remnant of these claims.

Among the properly ecclesiastical sources of revenue the **tithe** permanently occupies an important place; it had long been claimed by the Church as a universal divine right, but was only more generally given effect to in this period. Introduced into **Denmark** by Cnut the Saint, in 1086, but, as elsewhere, only reluctantly tolerated, the tithe right raised a revolt of the peasants in Scania. In **Ireland**, the closer attachment to Rome (*vid. sup.*, p. 303), in the end of the twelfth century led to the introduction of the tithe; so likewise in **Portugal** and **Spain**.

In consequence of the principle that church property might not be arbitrarily alienated, the Church now asserted the demand that laymen should not be in possession of the enjoyment of the tithe; at the same time many ecclesiastical tithes (along with some which were not of ecclesiastical origin), had come into

secular hands. Kings had given in fief to laymen the titheable property bestowed by them on the Church, or the bishops, as in many cases, had made such bestowals, partly to their advowees, partly in particular to their servitors, whom they required in order to render their military services. Or patrons, to whom according to the earlier view the churches built upon their land properly belonged, had retracted again the tithes which had been made over to the clergy. Against this the consciousness of the Church arose in the eleventh century under Gregory VII. The ecclesiastical tithes were to be given back by the laity, even when they had received them from kings or bishops.¹ This was an interference with existing rights, such as Gregory VII. was not afraid to make, but at first with little consequence. Frederick I. was able to declare at the diet at Gelnhausen in 1180, that the tithes were conferred upon the powerful as fiefs, in order that they might become defenders of the Church, which was in need of protection, and therefore interested himself in the so-called *decimæ infeudatæ* as legitimate, and the Third Lateran Council of 1179 at least confined itself (can. 14) to the transference of tithes from laymen to laymen. Awe of the Church, however, caused many tithes held by laymen to be presented to the Church or to monasteries, or surrendered in return for reasonable indemnity.

A further important source of revenue was continuously formed by **bequests**, so much the more as **all testamentary matters were the affair of the spiritual court**. The influence of pastors and confessors was further strengthened by the fact that according to the regulation of Alexander III. wills made on the deathbed before the pastor and two or three other persons were to have legal force; soon the presence of the pastor was actually required. While this was of influence, specially in England and France, the Church in Germany had long to combat the contrary Germanic view that a valid testament could only be made by a person who still "walked the street without stay or staff." The **Crusades** also frequently afforded the Church opportunity of enriching itself by **purchases** and **mortgages**, so likewise the continuation of the already ancient relationship, according to which **common freemen**, who were unable to protect themselves, preferred to receive their properties from the Church as rent-hold. Besides, it was now sought, as has been remarked, to secure the Church, apart naturally from its existing feudal obligations, in freedom from taxation of its properties. It boldly set up the principle of **entire freedom from taxes**; only of its own free-will would it contribute to the relief of public necessity and that only with the approval of the bishops (Third Lateran Council, 1179), and even only with that of the Pope (Fourth Lateran Council, can. 46). The imperial declaration of Frederick II., of 10th November, 1220, was referred by the Pope to the free-

¹ Synod of Rome, 1078, can. 6; Second Lateran Synod, 1139, can. 10, and more than once.

dom of the Church from all taxes ; but **the Church never succeeded in carrying into effect these claims**, by which she desired to escape secular greed, and the cities were now specially successful in defending themselves against them.

5. Influence of the Hierarchy on legal life.

The **exalted influence of the Church on the secular power** is based in the last resort on the claim of the Church to be the exponent of the divine will and so of the law which is binding on all, and at the same time on the spiritual power of the Keys bestowed upon her.

1. Even where the independence of the sphere of the secular power is maintained, it appears to be the **duty of the secular sword**, in acknowledgment of the divine law, **to place itself at the service of the requirements of the Church**. The Emperor as guardian-steward of the Church ought to **lend the secular arm to the maintenance in its purity of the Church's faith** by means of his law. In continuation of that which the Emperors of the Roman Empire had already recognised, and CHARLEMAGNE had also regarded as the duty of a Christian king, it is maintained that **violation of the Christian faith**, the basis of the life of the Christian Church, is at the same time to be prosecuted with punishment as a **crime against civil society**. Infamy, confiscation, forfeiture of the *testamenti factio* and in certain circumstances death itself, are among the penalties ordained, and these penalties¹ acknowledged by the Church received confirmation in the constitutions of the German Emperors, as is shown especially by the constitutions of Frederick II. of 1220 and succeeding years.² To this subject also belong the reliefs afforded by the secular government in cases of complaint as to interference in the ecclesiastical sphere, and the recognition and securing of the liberties of the Church, as is shown by the Golden Bull of Frederick II. in 1213, the constitutions of 1220 sqq. above mentioned, and other documents.

2. But in particular, the spiritual censures of **excommunication** and the **interdict**, which in its effects extended much further into civic life, in spite of all conflicts in individual cases, are generally recognised by the secular power, which concedes their legal consequences by making **secular outlawry** follow the ban if reconciliation with the Church is not sought within six weeks, which outlawry can only be set aside after the release of the ban. At the same

¹ *Vid.* Decretorum Gregorii IX. liber v. tit. 7.

² MGL. II. 243 sqq.

time, a public decree¹ was required for the actual occurrence of the civil disadvantages, especially the refusal of judicial prosecution, which arose therefrom. But the spread of the abuse of excommunication as a weapon for the secular interests of the hierarchy, necessitated the emergence of a growing opposition of the secular power, such as comes out in so many conflicts of the popes with the emperors. Especially noteworthy is the line of conduct of Louis IX. in France in the thirteenth century; he refused to compel those who had been excommunicated in such conflicts to reconciliation with the Church by depriving them of their properties. The notion is here asserted with ever-growing power, that the government must form its own judgment as to the justice or injustice of such a ban and decide accordingly and afford protection against an unjust ban. Here lies the root of the doctrine, subsequently developed in the French domain, of the so-called **appelationes ab abusu**.

3. Along with other sins, the Church threatens with **ecclesiastical penalties** those also which lead to the disturbance of civil life and order, and so encroaches deeply in this reference upon the secular sphere. She had laboured most successfully to bring about the peace of God, and constantly threatened transgressions of it with ecclesiastical censures. But similarly **piracy** and **beach-combing**, **usury** and **false-coining** and the like, also the custom of tournaments which was offensive to the Church, and finally the custom of the ordeals which had formerly been tolerated and sanctioned by the Church, were placed under her censure. The penal judgment of the Church not only upon heresy, but also upon the things mentioned, found a specially solemn expression in the ban uttered on certain days, especially on **Thursday in Passion Week**, in a general **contumacial process**. From the thirteenth century a ban of this sort was solemnly uttered "*in cæna Domini*" against whole classes of persons.² The history of the papacy shows how the popes make use of this process even for the prohibition of new taxes and imposts. In reference to such contumacial process of the Pope *in cæna Domini* the synod of Wurzburg of 1287 ordained that the bishops should proceed by means of similar solemn declarations against any one (even against archbishops).

The final judgment on many offences of this sort now also lay in

¹ *Constitutio Frederici*, II., 1220. MGL. II., 236.

² Nicholas III. in 1280 collected the regulations against heretics (*Magnum bullarium Romanum*, I. 156). The oldest printed form of the *bullæ in cæna Domini* is that of Urban V. 1365.

the hands of the so-called **Synodal Court** (*vid. sup.*, p. 217), at which in consequence of the semi-secular procedure **secular vindictive penalties**, especially **fin**es, were applied **alongside of the spiritual penances**. But when, in accordance with the state of the matter, such penalties were to be applied against life and limb, the case was handed over for this purpose to the secular judge.

With the contemporary development of the purely secular penal law there arose out of these circumstances a certain rivalry between the secular and the spiritual court, so that, towards the end of this period, the principle emerged on the ecclesiastical side, that, as soon as the secular court had punished a crime, it might no longer be censured in the synodal court. In this way only the offences which directly attacked the life of the Church remained subject to the exclusive judgment of the spiritual judges. The Church, however, retained an essential share in the administration of the penal law, in so far as, whenever she herself or the clergy were injured, she allowed the accuser the choice between the secular and the ecclesiastical forum; and so also in the case of other offences, when they had an ecclesiastical or religious aspect, she herself declared the penalties threatened in the civil law, whenever the secular judge had not fulfilled his duty.¹ But in the thirteenth century participation in this jurisdiction was more and more withdrawn from the synodal courts.

4. The increase in the number of matters which were exclusively reserved **to the spiritual court** is specially characteristic of the spirit of the whole development in this period. Not only the affairs of marriage, wills and oaths, and complaints of usury were so regarded, but also complaints and crimes of the crusaders, and further all affairs of widows, minors and orphans and *personæ miserabiles*; indeed, seeing that the Church is the last retreat of justice, **recourse to the spiritual court is claimed for all cases** (*in defectu justitiæ secularis*).

In this sphere too, at first even in the case of churchmen who decidedly champion the preponderance of the spiritual power over the secular, such as Bernard of Clairvaux,² a lively feeling specially asserts itself of the great extent to which the Church is entangled in this way in a mass of secular affairs, in which its spiritual character threatens to be smothered. So much the more powerfully on the secular side, under the strong sense of ecclesiastical oppression, grows the feeling of its intolerableness and the disturbing consequences of these encroachments upon the entire secular sphere. Here also the increased strength of the political consciousness of France shows itself most decidedly.³ After the empire of the

¹ Hence was developed in the following period the principle of the so-called *præventio*.

² *De consideratione*, I. 3.

³ *Vid. GIESELER*, II. 2, 275.

Hohenstaufens had been overthrown in Germany, attempts at least were made here at exertions to demarcate more carefully the boundaries between spiritual and secular courts, and the Council of Mayence of 1261 expresses the motive therefore in can. 18: *ne sæculari judicium enervetur*.

6. The internal relations of the Clergy.

The outcome of the historical development was, that on the one hand the power and influence of the higher ecclesiastical dignitaries increased very considerably through the formation of the **spiritual territories** by means of the grant of the highest criminal court and other rights to the bishoprics; on the other hand their **spiritual power** underwent certain not unessential limitations through the above delineated encroachments of the **Papacy which was raising itself to absolute power**. Hence arose the constrained position of the metropolitans, who were obliged to beg the Pope for the **pallium**, and who lost important rights, especially that of the **confirmation** of bishops. The provincial synods led by them now lost the right of judging as courts of first instance over bishops. Innocent III. in 1199, designates the right, reserved to the Pope, of deposing bishops, a divine ordinance. The successful conflict of the investiture-controversies next resulted in the fact that with the exclusion on principle of all lay participation in the episcopal election, as was declared by Innocent III., and afterwards by Gregory IX., the **episcopal chapters became a limit on the episcopal power itself**. The clergy of the episcopal church joined themselves together to form a close corporation, which as an **episcopal presbytery** and at the same time as **representatives** of the **diocesan clergy** formed the episcopal **senate**, to whose approval the bishops were bound in important cases. In the course of time they obtained the right of jurisdiction over their own members, and as exclusive holders of the right of election attempted to prescribe **conditions** to the bishop to be elected in the so-called **capitulations of election**. Innocent III. in 1204 rejects such *juramenta in damnum episcopalis juris*, without however being able to hinder influences of this sort in practice.

The enormous increase of secular business causes the spiritual **jurisdiction** of the bishops to be increasingly transferred to the **archidiaconate**. The latter frequently holding the provostship of the episcopal church or also of collegiate foundations, become judicial lords with far-reaching authority. In the extensive North German dioceses we also find so-called **Archidiaconi minores**, frequently rural deans, who obtain archidiaconal rights. From the twelfth century in many dioceses, the archdeacons, who formerly merely exercised jurisdiction as

delegates of the bishop, obtain the rights of **ordinary jurisdiction**, *i.e.* belonging to them on account of their office, to a wider or narrower extent. Innocent III.¹ bluntly designates an archdeacon *ordinarius iudex*. In this case the archdeacons exercise the jurisdiction in a court of their own through special spiritual officials. Meanwhile a reaction in the interest of the episcopal right makes its appearance, by the limitation of the rights of the archdeacons to keep officials of their own, and by making the decision of certain important matters dependent on the delegation of the bishop. It was just this which gave rise to the institution of the **episcopal officials**; the name official indeed often designates the archdeacon himself as the holder of the jurisdiction, but frequently, especially in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, so-called *officiales foranei* appear alongside of the archdeacon, appointed by the bishop for particular parts of the diocese, to exercise certain rights in concurrence with the archdeacon, but frequently also *officiales principales* or *vicarii generales* in the episcopal seat itself, whose duty it is to exercise jurisdiction in second instance or in the matters reserved from the archdeacons in first instance.

The **arch presbyters**, at the head of the deaneries or *christianitates* (p. 101), who, in distinction from the deans of the episcopal church, are designated *decani rurales* (rural deans), have to bear supervision over the conduct of office and the behaviour of the clergy, the direction of the regular clerical assemblies, the supervision of the moral and ecclesiastical conduct of the laity and the care for ecclesiastical property, and in all these relationships stand under the supervision of the archdeacons; but at times they emerge into a more independent position and are endowed with jurisdiction.

Another far-reaching limitation of the powers of the bishops consists in the fact that independent spiritual spheres were formed by granting secular and spiritual immunity to abbeys in the midst of the dioceses, on the holders of which even the episcopal jurisdiction frequently devolved.

In consequence of the double position of the bishops, the diocesan synods presided over by them, which have importance especially through their participation in the episcopal jurisdiction, frequently receive a secular admixture by the participation of vassals.

The wide-spread custom of conferring **parochial benefices** or the **parochial right** in general on chapters or monasteries, in very many cases promotes the abuse of the administration of the parish by mere vicars appointed by the titulars.

In other ways also the bishops seek to disburden themselves of their spiritual activity. Connected with this subject, alongside of the already mentioned **officials** there are the so-called **pœnitentiarii**, who as coadjutors of the bishop represent him in preaching and hearing confession, and in the care of souls in general. The institution of so-called **bishops consecrate** (*episcopi in partibus infidelium*) already begins to show itself towards the end of this period.

7. The celibacy of priests.

Literature: J. A. u. Aug. THEINER, *die Einführung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit bei d. chr. geistl. u. ihre Folgen*, 1828.

The relentless carrying out of the reforms of Gregory VII. decided the prevalence of the **celibacy of priests**, the universality

¹ Epist. XIV. 451.

of which was only made effective after long resistance in many national churches.

In England the exertions of Anselm and subsequent papal legates had very little success in the entire twelfth century; the precepts of the Church remained a dead letter and merely gave the kings opportunity of raising a tax from married priests. The requirement only permeated to the **Northern** kingdoms in the thirteenth century; in Scania the revolted peasants had already demanded the establishment of the marriage of priests in 1180, for the protection of their wives and maidens. A synod of **Sleswick** in 1222 still discussed the carrying out of celibacy, as did also a Swedish synod at Skeninge near Linköping. In Hungary the ecclesiastical requirement was only victorious in 1267. The case was similar in Poland, Silesia and Bohemia, and even in individual districts of Germany, as in the diocese of Liège, the resistance was obstinate.

But in spite of the fact that the reform was not carried out absolutely and uniformly, Gregory VII. had so effectually imparted the tendency to the Church, that it could not again break away from it. To the higher grades of the clergy, from the sub-deacon upwards, entrance into matrimony was entirely forbidden, so that such alliances had to be dissolved and were not held to be real marriages (Second and Third Lateran Councils). On the other hand, the marriages of the lower clergy might not be dissolved, but by entrance into marriage they lost their ecclesiastical benefices (Alexander III.). The injurious consequences of the prohibition of marriage cast their dark shadows on the condition of the clergy, and through them on the Christian lay world. In spite of all the exertions of synods, concubinage could not be extirpated, so that many bishops provided themselves with a source of revenue by permitting it. Worse was the rank growth of sexual sins, even of the darkest character, which had a poisonous effect on the whole condition of morality, and undermined the authority of the clergy among the people. Serious churchmen recognized the frightful danger. The greatly esteemed Parisian theologian, Petrus Comestor (1170), said that the devil had never so ensnared the Church as on this point.

The **dissoluteness** of the clergy, the worst phenomena of which were rooted in the precept of celibacy, was further promoted by the development of the papal system: the favouring and facilitation of appeals to Rome, the decay of the provincial synods which was connected therewith, and the fact that complaints against the clergy were made more difficult. The other **chief source** of corruption consisted in the secular position of the clergy, the heaping up of secular properties in their hands, which, in sharp contradiction

to their ostensible contempt for the world, made **avarice** and luxurious enjoyment of life the chief mainspring of ecclesiastical activity. Herein Bernard of Clairvaux recognises something truly and really antichristian, and the best opinions of the Church (as Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *De corrupto ecclesie statu*) bewailed the corruption of the clergy, the main roots of which they were unable to cut off.

8. Canonical Life. Augustinian Canons; Victorines; Premonstratensians.

Sources:—The so-called *Regula Augustini* in LUC. HOLSTEN.—BROCKIE, *Cod. regul.* II. 120; DAMIANI *Epp.* I., 6 *ad Alexandrum II.* (Ml. 144) and *opusc.* 22, 24, 27 (Ml. 145).—*Literature*: THOMASSINUS, *Vetus et nova eccl. disciplina* I., III., c. 11 and 21.—*Sources*: VITA NORBERTI ed. WILMANS, MGS. 12, 663 sqq., and *ibid.* p. 653; HERMANNI MONACHI *de miraculis St. Mariæ Landunensis Excerpta*. Also ASB., June 1., 804. Manuscript matter in (L. Ch. HUGO) *La vie de St. Norbert*, Luxb. 1704.—*Literature*: HUGO, *Annales ordinis Præmonstr.*, Nanceji 1734; WINTER, *die Præmonstratenser des 12. Jhdts. und ihre Bedeutung f. d. nordöstl. Deutschland*, Berl. 1865.

The reformation of the Church prompted by its internal necessity the establishment and intensification of the **canonical, monastically regulated** life (*vid.* p. 103) of the clergy in the cathedral chapters and foundations. Practically, the collective life of the canons at the minster and their spiritual co-operation in the service of the choir had almost disappeared. The ancient **rule of Aix-la-Chapelle** (*vid.* p. 103, note 1) had left the canons their private property, but really required monastic life in common in the common enjoyment of the ecclesiastical revenues. But as a matter of fact permanent incomes had been assigned to the individual members of the chapters from the rich properties of the bishoprics, which they enjoyed in their own cures, while they caused the common service of the choir to be attended to by vicars, so that finally only the younger canons (*domicellares*) lived in common under the cathedral schoolmaster, till in the end even this last essential remnant of the ancient institution dissolved with the rise of the universities. If in these secular chapters the original conception had quite disappeared, it was again to be realized in the establishment and intensification of the **vita canonica**, and along with the entire surrender of all private property (Nicholas II., Alexander II.). For this purpose Peter Damiani founded upon the requirements of Augustine in his treatise: *sermões de moribus clericorum*, from which a *regula Augustini* was next compiled in opposition to the *regula Aquisgranensis*. The chapters reformed according to this rule were called from the twelfth century onwards those of the **Regular Canons** in contrast with those of the

Secular Canons. In most cases this reform was only of short duration. The rich prebends of the chapter were more and more claimed by the younger members of noble families. In the thirteenth century it was attempted, naturally in face of the decided opposition of Gregory IX. and Nicholas IV., to make noble birth a general condition of admission. In this way secular interests maintained the preponderance.

Nevertheless, in a number of cases the reformation exerted a most important influence on the development of the Church. Towards the end of the eleventh century Bishop ALTMANN founded at Passau several establishments for **clerici regulares**. Next, Ivo of Chartres (as Provost, afterwards as Abbot, of S. Quintin, near Beauvais) and GERHOLD and ARNO of Reichersberg wrought to the same purpose. **Augustinian Canonries** also begin to serve as points of support in mission fields (*e.g.* Neumünster and Vicelin). In the Holy Land regular canons of the Holy Sepulchre are mentioned. The monastic rule binds together several foundations of this sort after the fashion of the monastic congregations. Thus the Canons of S. Victor spread from Paris over the whole of France. William of Champeaux, the teacher of the episcopal school at Paris, after his quarrel with Abelard (*vid. infra*), had transferred his school to the Regular Canons of S. Augustine in the Chapel of S. Victor, who went under the guidance of the chapter of S. Victor at Marseilles.¹ When William of Champeaux became Bishop of Châlons in 1113, he introduced Victorine canons into the cathedral chapter there; the same thing was done by various French bishops from 1131; the congregation spread to Italy, England, Scotland and Lower Saxony; the English Church began to appoint disciples of S. Victor to its highest spiritual posts. Near Halberstadt, a disciple of S. Victor, Bishop Reinhard, founded in Hamersleben a cloister of Regular Canons of S. Augustine, in which his nephew Hugo, born Count of Blankenburg and Regenstein, afterwards the ornament of the school of S. Victor in Paris, received his first education.

But the most important phenomenon in this field is that of the **Premonstratensians**. NORBERT, born in Xanten, a man of noble descent, holding in his early years a canonry in his native city and another in Cologne, for a time court-chaplain to Henry V., under a sudden conversion turned away from the secular occupations of the higher clergy, travelled about as a preacher of penance, and when this gave rise to offence (Synod of Fritzlar in 1118), renounced his benefices and his property and obtained from Pope Gelasius II.

¹ *Hist. lit. de la France*, IX. 113; XII. 476 sqq. and 155 sqq.

(then in Languedoc) full power to travel and preach, and traversed France as a zealous preacher of penance, accompanied by two lay-preachers, intentionally avoiding contact with clergy and monks. The Bishop of Laon desired to make use of him in reforming the cathedral chapter there, but without success. Finally he settled in a waste in the forest of Coucy in the diocese of Laon in 1120-21 with a few companions, and here there arose a society of regular canons: **Pratum monstratum** or Præmonstratum (in allusion to the direction of a heavenly vision). They assumed the white robe of the **Cistercians**. The founder, who was entirely devoted to the papal ideas and who with his companions successfully brought heretics to return to the Church, became acquainted with the Emperor Lothar at Spire, and was by him made Archbishop of Magdeburg in 1126. Here he had to undergo heated conflicts with the secularised cathedral chapter, and, to support his ecclesiastical activity, brought in Premonstratensians, to whom he made over the collegiate foundation of S. Mary in Magdeburg (1129). The latter became the second mother-cloister of the Premonstratensians, whose branch foundations, mostly composed of twelve clergy or twelve lay-brothers (so-called *conversi*), became the most important points of support in East Saxony and east of the Elbe (Leitzkau) for the Christianizing and Germanizing of the Wend country. Norbert exercised an important influence on Lothar and on his decision in favour of Innocent against Anacletus; afterwards on the Emperor's commission he negotiated with Innocent II. in France, showed him Premontrée now grown to a stately size, and in 1132 accompanied the Emperor to Rome as arch-chancellor for Italy; he was only able to work a few years longer in Magdeburg (till 1125).

Like the close alliance of the Magdeburg monastery with the archbishopric, it also became a matter of great importance that the cathedral foundations of Brandenburg, Havelberg and also Ratzeburg passed into the hands of the Premonstratensians. Bishop Anselm of Havelberg (afterwards Archbishop of Ravenna), and a series of other bishops proceeded from this society. The whole order, which quickly spread itself over different countries, confirmed by Honorius II. in 1123, and again by Innocent II. in 1134, was to stand under the leadership of the parent monastery of Premontrée. But the close alliance of the Magdeburg monastery with the archbishopric there and its ecclesiastical duties, and the preponderance of Norbert's personality, who besides gave the Saxon Premonstratensians some peculiarities in the garb of the order and in customs of worship, brought about a pretty independent position for the Saxon Province (*circarie*) of the order and a closer attachment of it under the leadership of the provost to S. Mary's in Magdeburg. The schism between Alexander III., who recognised the French Premonstratensians, and the imperial Pope Victor IV. brought about an entire alienation of the Saxon Premonstratensians, who took up a neutral attitude in the schism. The parent-monastery subsequently carried

its point that the provosts of the Saxon Premonstratensians should once more be obliged to appear at the annual general chapters in Premontrée, but this intercourse gradually died away.

As the regular canons were an *ordo clericorum*, they also held the *cura animarum* in their churches and parishes. But as they formed **monasteries**, their right to the pastoral office and to hear confession was contested, against which Ivo of Chartres took them zealously under protection. Practically the entire activity of the Premonstratensians was founded upon these rights, which were tacitly presupposed in their constitutions, so that only the relation of the pastors to the abbacies was regulated (DENIFLE in ALKG. I. 174 sq.).

CHAPTER THIRD.

The popular Life of the Church. The Church's Means of Edification and Discipline.

1. Preaching.

Literature: W. WACKERNAGEL, R. CRUEL and LINSSENMEYER, *vid.* p. 119 and SCHRÖDER in Steinmeyer's *Anzeiger f. d. Alterthum*, VII. 172 sqq.; ZEJSCHWITZ in ZÖCKLER, *Hdbch. d. theol. Wissensch.*, III. 266 of the 1st ed.; C. SCHMIDT in StKr. 1846, 243: LEROY DE LA MARCHE, *La chaire française au moyen âge spécialement au XII^{me} siècle*, Par. 1868; BARTSCH, *Grundriss der provenç. Lit.*, Elberfeld 1872; TEN. BRINK, *Gesch. d. engl. Literatur*, 1877, vol. I.

EVEN in this period eminent bishops bestowed care upon the duty of preaching in their dioceses, though the extensive affairs of their profession, which had to so great an extent been secularized, especially in the great German dioceses, did not allow the great majority to attain a constant activity as preachers. At the best the bishops seem as a rule to have confined themselves to sermons on feast-days, and frequently to have only given their sermons in the form of short addresses (*admonitiones*). Bishop HERMANN of Prague (1099-1122), a *homiliarium* of whose has been discovered,¹ is credited with zealous exertions as to preaching in the language of the people, as he himself also, though by birth a German, preached in Bohemian. Bishops who were active in **mission-fields**, were specially successful in working by preaching, such as BENNO of Meissen, who in his forty years of office as bishop († 1106) also preached to the surrounding Slavs, and above all OTTO of Bamberg, who was famous as a popular preacher († 1139); not less the Cistercian Berno² who was raised to the episcopate in Schwerin, and others. But these are exceptions; hence, with the increasingly pressing need of ecclesiastical instruction for the people, Innocent III. is obliged to impress upon the bishops, that if on account of their business affairs they are themselves diverted from this duty, or even if they have not the requisite culture, they ought to provide suitable substitutes in preaching as well as in the care of souls.

But the most powerful influences on whole districts of people

¹ Ed. HECHT, 1863.

² WINTER, *die Cistercienser*, I. 82 sqq.

proceeded from men, who were conscious of the special vocation and impulse towards popular preaching.

Thus Canon NORBERT came forward as a preacher of penance and morals in France, even before he had received full power from the Pope to do so in 1118 (*vid. sup.* p. 319), and for that end adopted the French language. The like is known of the deep reaching influence of ROBERT of Arbrissel. The powerful movement of the ideas of the reformation of the Church sought entrance in this manner to larger popular circles. But those religious efforts after reform, which came into opposition with the church itself, as was the case with PETER of Bruys and the fiery orator, Deacon HENRY (*vid. infra*), and likewise with ARNOLD of Brescia (p. 267), also influence whole masses of the people.

But alongside of these the **enthusiasm for the Crusades** now awakens popular preachings of kindling power. The example of Pope URBAN II. himself, at the Synod of Clermont, was followed by numerous others; among them, of specially powerful influence, was BERNARD of Clairvaux, whose French sermons, although not understood, carried away the people even on German soil. The powerful preacher, FULK of Neuilly, appeared at the end of the twelfth century.

Even when in his country charge he attracted the attention of Paris, where the learned doctors incited each other to listen to the new Paul. Bishops invited him to preach in their dioceses, and in Paris his street-preachings carried away the people to penance and conversion. His former teacher, PETRUS CANTOR, invited him to preach the crusade. His sermons were written down by others and for long read publicly to the people; he even originated a school of his own of popular orators, composed of men also who were in high office in the Church. In England too it had its representatives, where a certain Master WALTER of London and the famous subsequent Archbishop STEPHEN LANGTON were of their number. Other examples of French popular preaching were not lacking in France in the twelfth century.

The new advance of the **canonical** life and of **monasticism** in this period was also accompanied by the gaining of new forces of popular instruction by preaching, especially in the regular clergy of the Augustinian canons, among the Premonstratensians and in the Cistercian Order. The practice of preaching in the monasteries was chiefly aimed at their own inmates, and therefore along with the monks proper, part of whom were deficient in culture, at the so-called lay-brothers (*conversi*); but it was also aimed at the people and laity who were dependents of the monastery, and who sought their edification there. Hence the preaching was presented in the vernacular.

The conception, according to which the monk, as being dead to the world, had only to lead a life of penitential retirement, still battled with the view that he also held the right of preaching,¹ if provided with the requisite ordination,

¹ *Vid.* RUPERTUS TUITIENSIS, *Altercatio monachi et clerici, quod liceat monacho prædicare* (ML. 170).

and the latter began to gain the victory in accordance with the great ecclesiastical profession of the monasticism of the time. GUIBERT of Nogent was still of opinion, that every pious and learned man ought to teach, even when he did not belong to the teaching class. But the preaching of even the educated cleric without regular ecclesiastical commission (*missio canonica*) is soon combated as an encroachment upon episcopal and pastoral power, and the attempt of pious laymen impelled by the spirit was met from the time of LUCIUS III. and Innocent III. by the prohibition of preaching without papal or episcopal permission.

The entire **parochial clergy** held the uncontested right of preaching. But under the conditions of ecclesiastical culture among the rural clergy a general and regular exercise of this right cannot be conceived. Indeed under a sense of the danger involved in the heretical movements, the Synod at Trèves in 1221 (can. 8) went the length of **forbidding** uneducated and inexperienced priests to preach, because it caused more harm than good. The higher requirements of the Carolingian age upon the culture of the clergy had long shrunk to a minimum.

An immense number of the clergy belonged to the so-called **sacerdotes simplices** or **illiterati**, and had been unable to educate themselves in the episcopal or monastic schools, but had only perhaps been for a time under a priest as scholars, and so had barely acquired the requisite ability to chant, read mass and other matters of ritual. As, according to the Carolingian laws, the priests were never to read mass alone, but were always to be accompanied by an administrant (*clericus*, or *clericus scholaris*), the village pastors, having little means, took boys or youths into their service for secular functions at the same time, and this was for many of the latter the cheapest and simplest way into the clerical profession. This tendency was aided by the want of books, under the dear price of which the stock of most of the village clergy was confined to a few ecclesiastical books, the missal, lectionary, breviary, and penitential. The low average moral condition of the parochial clergy, who in extensive circles were living in concubinage, and frequently stood in slight esteem, was also preventive of a fruitful preaching activity. How far the growth of sermon literature, especially of collections of sermons, in the twelfth century, affords grounds of inference for the more extended use of this auxiliary means beyond the monasteries and among the parish clergy, remains doubtful. In any case, in regard to this point also, apart from the appearance of extraordinary preachers, the monasteries remain the chief foci, from which the populace receive spiritual nourishment.

GUIBERT of Nogent (*de Novigento* † 1124) as the companion of his abbot on a journey of visitation, on which he had to preach in the monastic convents, was requested to produce a more comprehensive composition in the style of his own preaching as a source of material for all sorts of sermons, and responded in his **Moralia geneseos**, which is preceded by a tractate on the style and contents of the sermon. To this his *Tropologie* on Hosea, Amos and Lamentations also attach themselves. But especially influential in wide circles

was the collection of HONORIUS of Autun (*vid. infra*), *Speculum ecclesiæ*,¹ sermons on feast and saints' days, and also on ordinary Sundays, preached by Honorius himself. This homiletic help for preachers was made use of for a long time and in many ways, and also as an instrument for the edification of the laity. Alongside of it mention must be made of the **Deflorationes sanctorum**, by the almost contemporary Abbot WERNER of Ellerbach, and the homilies of GODFREY of Admont. But in the twelfth century collections in the **vernacular** appeared alongside of those in Latin.²

The sermons are composed partly in the style of the older homilies, partly in that of the simpler or more compressed sermon or tractate and shorter addresses. A text is not always expressly mentioned, and for this purpose use is made not only of the words of Scripture but also of passages taken from the liturgical books. The Fathers are largely drawn upon, the narrative style is preferred, in relation to which the Old Testament is much utilized, and use is made of symbolical and allegorical explanation. Dogmatic teaching is much less prominent than practical morality.³

Good works, occupation with the legends of the saints, growing worship of Mary indicate the favourite tendencies. Christ, they are fond of calling simply "our God"; parallel with the spiritual love-ardour of the cult of Mary goes the preference for and turning to account of the Song of Songs allegorically explained, especially from the time of Bernard of Clairvaux. Historical and mythological matter is also unhesitatingly utilized.

The **mendicant orders** in the thirteenth century next introduce a new turn of events, both by the appearance of extraordinary individual popular preachers, and by the rise in the cities of their preaching churches.

With preaching in the vernacular, such as we must presuppose alongside of Latin preaching before clerical assemblies (*sermones ad clerum*) and also in monasteries, the vernacular likewise gains its fixed position in the **Latin Mass**. For here the regular **parochial preaching** has its proper place, and as a rule after the reading of

¹ Ml. 172, 807 sqq.

² *Vid.* on them LINSSENMAIER, pp. 191-317, where those in German are given in full.

³ Cf. GUIBERT de Novigent., *liber quo ordine sermo fieri debet* (Ml. 156, 9 sqq.): faith on the whole, he says, stands fast among the hearers of the Church, but morality is wanting. ALANUS ab Ins., *Summa de arte prædicatoria* (Ml. 210, 111), assigns the chief place to the *instructio morum*, and would have the text taken from the Gospels, Psalms, Pauline epistles and writings of Solomon, on account of their applicability to morals.

the Gospel. In the twelfth century it is still delivered from the reading desk within the *cancelli* (hence *Kanzel*, pulpit). It is only with the increase of large churches in the thirteenth century that the practical necessity of making oneself intelligible seems to have led to the erection of the **pulpit** against a pillar or in a corner of the nave. But with **German preaching** there are united other **portions of the liturgy**, which are likewise given in German. Among these, besides the changing ecclesiastical announcements, as especially that of the **saints' days** which fall to be observed during the week, there are the **confession of faith**, the **confession of sin** with the general **absolution**, the general **intercessions** for the living and the dead, and the **Lord's Prayer**. Here, therefore, are contained important elements for the religious-ethical influence of Divine worship. The confession of faith is introduced by the *abrenuntiatio*, made familiar since baptism. The text of the confession is handled with a certain freedom, and contains additions of a dogmatic character. The signification of the confession of sins and the general absolution is limited in such a way as to prevent their trenching upon the priestly procedure in the confessional.¹ Moreover all these portions are at one time extended to greater length, and at another confined to mere indications. The use of the confession of faith does not appear as a universal custom.

In many cases the sermon, as an exposition of the Gospel or Epistle which necessarily formed part of the liturgy, and even of both of them, was confined to a quite short address, so that the main stress fell on the remaining parts of the German liturgy. Finally, there was frequently attached to the preaching address, especially on Feasts and Saints' days, a further short verse of song in German, closing as a rule with the *Kyrie eleison*, to which German sermons invite the hearers with some such words as: "Now raise ye your cry, all the saints help us," or: "Let us praise the Son of God," and the like. The creed moreover was to be joined in by the people kneeling, and in a low voice. Berthold of Ratisbon still calls the singing of the congregation a good custom, where it exists; to sing the *Kyrie* after the liturgy was a right of the laity, he says; "but ye sang it not alike and could not make it ring in tone; hence we had to sing it."

¹ Honorius, Ml. 172, 824; *vid. sub* No. 4, *Confession and Absolution*.

2. The Sacraments.

Sources: [Ivo Carnotensis] *Micrologus de ecclesiasticis observationibus*, Bibl. Max., XVIII. 469 (Ml. 161); RUPERTI TUITIENSIS *de divinis officiis*, Ml. (167-170); HONORII AUGUSTODUNENSIS *gemma animæ* (Ml. 172, 541); STEPHANUS AUGUSTODUNENSIS, *de sacramento altaris* (Ml. 172, 1271 sqq.); JOHANNIS BELETHI, *l. divinorum officiorum ac eorundem rationum*, frequently appended to the chief work: GUILIELMI DURANTIS, *rationale divinorum officiorum libri VIII.*, Venetiis, 1609, and frequently.

The idea of the **sacrament**, which from of old was so wide in its range, is now further attached to all the acts and elements of divine worship, by which faith is convinced of receiving the divine benefits of salvation, especially to all those acts, in which a mysterious saving influence is conceived to attach to the use of sensuous objects. Thus GODFREY of Vendôme (*ob.* after 1128) accounts sacramental every act by means of which the consecration of men and churches is carried out. But out of the great number of things of this class, HUGO of St. Victor, in accordance with the ecclesiastical development hitherto, exalts the sacraments of Baptism and the Supper as the most preferable, by means of which salvation is received and retained, and distinguishes therefrom things that are only desirable for sanctification, and thirdly those, by means of which that which bestows the requisite endowment for the institution of the rest of the sacraments is furnished, *i.e.* the spiritual consecration of the *ordo* and the dedication of churches, *sacramenta ad salutem, ad exercitationem, ad præparationem*. To his second class belong all things such as holy water, ashes, consecrated palms, consecrated wax, all acts such as crossing oneself, exsufflation, bending the knees, and all sacred words, to which as *e.g.* to the appeal to the Trinity, mysterious influences are conceived to attach. The whole of this disquisition of the theologian brings vividly before us the great importance for popular piety which was held by the entire complex of the symbolical functions of the cult, in which there was seen not merely a sensuous symbolism but a mysterious saving influence, an interference of the divine in process of becoming evident to the senses.

All this finds its highest expression for the ecclesiastical consciousness in the **mystery of the Mass**, and in both its aspects, as **sacrificium** and **sacramentum**. The general pervasion of the idea of this mystery of the presence of the Deity in the sensuous sought various theological forms of expression in the beginning of this period. For in spite of the ecclesiastical repudiation of Berengar, the opinion opposed to his only gradually gained the victory. Many, indeed, censured Berengar's profane treatment of the ecclesiastical linguistic usage, the dialectical analysis of the believing extravagance of the liturgical expression, which without hesitation identified the sensuous image with the supersensuous object, but they also blamed the crass conception of his opponents, which was willing in blunt fashion to take literally the metaphorical and figurative manner of speech. Others, instead of a transubstantiation proper, would have assumed the notion of a so-called *impanatio* or other notions. Mystics like Bernard could speak very spiritual-

istically of the mystery of the Eucharist, without thereby losing the sense of a very real receiving of Christ in the Supper. He was able quite ingenuously to regard the transference of an inheritance through the symbol of the ring as an image of the divine grace which is imparted through the elements of the Supper. Others, like HUGO and RUPERT of Deutz, attached themselves to the patristic notions, according to which a mystical union of Christ with the earthly elements, and a reception of the divine-human nature of Christ thus brought about, were brought home to the mind without the hypothesis of an actual material transformation. In this connection the more intellectual conception is exhibited in the assertion of Rupert of Deutz, according to which the miracle is only carried out for faith, and the unbeliever accordingly receives nothing but bread and wine. In accordance with this also is the assertion of ROBERT PULLEYN, that only the bread which is really consumed in the Supper is the body of Christ.

The extravagance of ecclesiastical faith turns into the materialistic among the miracle-loving multitude, in the maintenance of the even older legend that here and there the body of Christ had appeared in the form of a child, or of bleeding flesh, or the like. But equally materialist appears the calculating judgment of the schoolmen, in which that mystical extravagance is crystallized into **Transubstantiation**; an expression which, used here and there from the beginning of the twelfth century, is given a fixed place in theology by PETER the Lombard, and receives ecclesiastical sanction from INNOCENT III. at the Fourth Lateran Council: "Jesus Christ is at once priest and sacrifice, whose body and blood are truly received in the sacrament of the altar under the form of bread and wine, inasmuch as the elements are transubstantiated by the divine power into body and blood, in order that for the carrying out of the mystery of unity we may receive of His that which He assumed of ours; a sacrament which only the duly ordained priest can perform." This mystery of the power of miracle in the hands of the priest now becomes the object of the inexhaustible hair-splitting subtlety of the school-men, which can soar to the absurd question, as to what came of the body of Christ when gnawed by beasts; but none the less it becomes the inexhaustible subject of the absorbed meditation of mystical faith. Thomas Aquinas's celebrated hymn: "*Pange lingua gloriosi corporis mysterium*" shows how wonderfully the two were able to blend.

In a certain connection with the advanced conception of the Supper stands the gradual extinction of **infant communion** in the twelfth century, to justify

which it was necessary to settle with the opposite authority of Augustine (I. 525). By the help of a passage, adduced as Augustinian in GRATIAN'S Decree (III. dist. 4, cap. 131), but which really came from Fulgentius, the absolute necessity of partaking of the Supper to salvation was contested. The danger of abuse of the consecrated elements appears as the chief motive. Help was probably sought in giving the unconsecrated host, which however Bishop Odo of Paris prohibited in 1196 (MANSI 22, 687). In the thirteenth century the administering of the Supper to little children was forbidden. But as a rule this is only to be regarded as applying to quite little children, in reference to the ancient custom of the Church of administering the Lord's Supper to the baptized after the act of baptism. Thus Thomas, where he treats of the withholding of the cup from laymen, speaks quite naturally of the partaking of the sacrament by *parvuli*. One synod (Synodus Bajocensis of the year 1300) only allows it after the seventh year.

Similarly this period contains the beginnings of the **withholding of the cup** from the laity, which is based on the danger of spilling the sacred wine; an important privilege is thereby created for the priests. The custom, which was already of some antiquity, of administering the bread soaked in wine in cases of the communion of children or the sick, becomes more general from the end of the eleventh century. Pope Urban II. and afterwards Paschal II. (1110) did indeed forbid the imperfect dispensation of the sacrament, appealing to the institution, and in the case of the communion of children and the sick permitted only the converse—the dispensation of the wine only. But the custom of administering the host only dipped in wine, is designated in **England** about the same time as a rite which varies from the institution. The ancient prohibition of it at the Council of Bracara in 675 (can. 2), which Gratian has admitted into the Decree under the name of the Roman Pope Julian, was repeated on the ground of the latter at the Council of London in 1175, can. 16. In the twelfth century, however, the evidences of the actual withholding of the cup are still infrequent. Robert Pulleyn holds Christ's institution in the double form as binding in the communion of priests. But, he says, that the manner of the administering of the Eucharist to the laity was left by Christ to his bride, the Church. The danger of spilling the blood of Christ is here asserted, which is much more present in carrying the sacrament to the sick. But in the theological treatment of the doctrine of the Supper the presupposition of participation in both elements is still unhesitatingly adopted as the starting point. In the thirteenth century ALEXANDER HALESIUS justifies the withholding of the cup, which he regards as an almost universal custom in the Church, in direct opposition to the prohibition of Pope Gelasius (vid. vol. i. 522) which had passed over into Gratian's Decree. ALBERTUS MAGNUS still acknowledges the imperfection of the sacrament without the wine. In Thomas's justification of the withholding of the cup, also, the reasons against it are first enunciated, but are then overthrown by appeal to the usage of many churches. In the year 1261 the General Chapter of the Cistercians withdrew the cup from the monks, lay-brothers and nuns; it was only to be received by the priests. Connected with this is the other custom of pouring unconsecrated wine for the laity into the cup after the priests had partaken, and when therefore it contained remains of the consecrated wine, and distributing it (the so-called rinsing cup). Just at this time, when the cup is being withdrawn from the laity, there is an increase of the so-called blood-miracles (bleeding hosts), which seem adapted to prove the scholastic doctrine, that the blood must also be conceived as contained in the Lord's body (*Christus totus in utraque specie*).

The heightened conception of the miracle of the Supper next leads in the thirteenth century to the **Adoration of the Sacrament**. The rite of elevation which is demonstrable among the Greeks from as early as the seventh century, among the Latins from the eleventh, was at first regarded as a merely symbolical act. CÆSARIUS of Hesterbach now narrates that Cardinal Wido, on occasion of his embassy to Germany in reference to the confirmation of the election of Emperor Otto IV., recommended the custom of prostration before the sacrament. At the elevation of the host all the people were to prostrate themselves at the sound of a small bell and remain in this attitude till the blessing of the cup. Similarly, when the sacrament is being carried through the streets to a sick person, a ministrant is to go before the priest with a bell, and all the people on the streets and in the houses are to prostrate themselves. He already appeals to the example of France. Pope HONORIUS III. ordained this universally in 1217 (*Decretum Gratiani*, III. 41, 10). In accordance with this, the ancient ecclesiastical custom, still confirmed by Alexander III., of intermitting kneeling and praying standing at divine services on Sundays and certain festal seasons, especially between Easter and Whitsunday, was abolished or at least restricted by GREGORY X., with express reservation of the kneeling at the elevation of the body of Christ.

The feast of **Corpus Christi** (*festum corporis domini*), for the special celebration of the mystery of the Supper, was first introduced in the diocese of Liège in 1259, at the instigation of a nun who appealed to a vision. Urban IV., formerly a canon of the Church of Liège, adopted it for the whole Church (1264). But its celebration only became gradually prevalent after Clement V. had ordained it anew in 1311 (*Clementine*, III., tit. 16).

For the great mass of the laity the custom of **partaking of the sacrament** fell away more and more, and even in prescribing attendance on the sacrament at least once a year, Innocent III. (Fourth Lateran Council, can. 21) really lays the main stress on the **auricular confession** which was brought into connection with it. English and French synods desired at least to make three attendances on the sacrament in the year the rule, but were unable to carry it out. More frequent participation in the sacrament becomes especially the affair of **monastic mysticism**, which thereby plunges itself into mystical union with the Saviour; and particularly in the nunneries of the thirteenth century, it is worked up to the ardour of spiritual love, which frequently works itself up at the same time to mystical delirium.

On the other hand the **significance of the Supper as a sacrifice**, apart from participation in the sacrament, acquires exalted importance for the whole of Christendom. Remembrance of the original sense of this sacrifice as the oblation of the community more and more disappears. The introduction of unleavened bread, in consequence of which the ancient offerings of the gifts of nature entirely disappear and are replaced by donations of money, also co-operate here. Theological doctrine does indeed long continue to main-

tain in the ancient manner the necessary connection of the **sacrificium** with participation in the sacrament.¹ Peter the Lombard also, in the discussion on the effects of the sacrament, theoretically pre-supposes that it has been actually partaken of and still conceives the sacrifice of the Mass entirely in the ancient sense as *memoria et representatio veri sacrificii et sanctæ immolationis factæ in cruce*. The sacrifice of the Mass, like the prayers of the Church and alms-giving, only avails those who have died in the communion of His body and blood. Even Thomas conceives the sacrifice of the Mass only as *imago quædam representativa passionis Christi*, but ascribes to it as the application of the suffering of Christ for the believing members of the Church the real efficacy of the latter, especially for those who are mentioned in the canon of the Mass as sacrificing. But the view of the **sacrifice of the Mass** which is practically developing into such great importance already finds in ALBERTUS MAGNUS the expression that the sacrifice is not mere *representatio*, but **immolatio vera**, *i.e. rei oblatae oblatio per manus sacerdotum*. In this way the sacrifice of the Mass by the priest appeared as the highest office of the Church. As the priest has to exercise the power of the keys, so also he has to produce the mystery and thereby, like Christ, in whose person he operates, becomes a mediator between God and man. Thomas expresses the decisive sense of the Church, when he says: **perfectio huius sacramenti non est in usu fidelium, sed in consecratione materiæ**.² The miraculous act of the Church through the priest is the main thing; hence for the laity the mere attendance at Mass, in which the *mysterium tremendum* is reverently looked upon as it passes, acquires the character of a pious work in and for itself; but secondly, pious merit is sought in the establishment (foundation) of Masses (private Masses, especially soul-Masses in memory of the dead). The foundation of such Masses now becomes a trade in masses for the clergy. English bishops in the thirteenth century exerted themselves in vain to raise a barrier against this trade in Masses, and the compulsion of the laity to render payment for them. The great quantity of Masses founded in turn supported the already existing increase in the numbers of the priests, particularly as only one Mass might be held daily at each altar of a church, and accordingly in

¹ DURANTI (*Rationale div. off.* IV., *De prædicatione*, fo. 55a of the ed. of 1480) gives to the public confession and absolution after the sermon the reference to the worthy preparation for the enjoyment of the sacrament, which is then either actually partaken of sacramentally or at least spiritually *i.e.* by faith (according to Augustine's saying *crede et manducasti*).

² Summa P. III., quæst 80, art. 12.

large churches it was necessary to establish many altars and many priests (vicars) for them.

In the case of the long practised and recommended **anointing of the sick** (Mark vi. 13; James v. 14, 15) the reference to healing of sickness had gradually become less prominent than a **sacramental** reference. It became the *extrema unctio*, a component part of the **dying sacrament**, the provision for the way for departing souls (*viaticum*). Peter the Lombard reckoned it among the seven sacraments of the Church; it was intended to serve the forgiveness of sins and the mitigation of bodily weakness. From that time the school-men exerted themselves to define its special effect in distinction from the rest of the preceding dying sacraments (absolution and the Eucharist). According to ALBERT it served to purify from the *reliquiæ peccatorum*, which THOMAS understood as applying to the remaining weakness and dislike of goodness, but BONAVENTURA to such blotting out of venial sins as afforded protection against their return. The original sense of the healing of the sick is now only regarded by Thomas as an accidental and accessory effect. The possibility of repeating this sacrament was contested by Godfrey of Vendôme (ca. 1100), but asserted by Peter of Clugny and Hugo of S. Victor and then universally maintained.

3. The Worship of Saints and Relics.

Sources: GUIBERTI de Novigento († 1124) *de pignoribus sanctorum*, Ml. 156; PETRI VENERABILIS *de miraculis sui temporis libri II.*, Ml. 189; CÆSARII MONACHI HEISTERBACENSIS *de miraculis et visionibus suæ ætatis libri XII.*, Coloniae 1591 and 1599, 8vo; JACOBI DE VORAGINE († 1298) *Legenda aurea sive historia Lombardica*. New ed. by GRASSE, Dresden and Leipz. 1846; KONRAD OF WURZBURG, *die goldene Schmiede*, ed. by W. GRIMM, 1840; *Marienlegende* ed. by FR. PFEIFFER, Wien 1863. — *Literature:* Vid. i. 504; ii. 214; TH. ESSER, *Gesch. des engl. Grusses* in JGG., V. 88 sqq.

This popular bent of piety, which from of old was most deeply rooted in the mediæval church, receives enhanced attention in this period, especially through the monasteries, and it receives new nourishment from the crusades and intimate contact with the East. The enthusiasm for the Holy Places seemed to afford tangible contact with the life of the Saviour and Biblical persons. From the Greek Church many saints who were there celebrated were taken over, such as S. Catherine, and Greek legendary matter found ready ears. The fantastic spirit of the age was inclined to find and accept sacred relics everywhere.

Thus the sacred lance, with which Christ's side was pierced, was discovered in Antioch in 1098, and along with the legend of S. LONGINUS was transplanted to the West. Similarly at the conquest of Cæsarea in 1101 the Holy Grail was discovered in a glass vessel. Various seamless **holy coats**, such as the ancient Greek Church had already known, made their appearance. The bodies of the holy **three kings** were transferred by Rainald of Dassel from Milan to Cologne. The believing inclination to find relics and bones of martyrs in all quarters met more than half-way the impostures of the sellers of relics. Near Cologne there was found about 1156 a large burying place with numerous female and male bones, and inscriptions also appeared along with them. Older accounts, in the

martyrologies on the 20th and 21st October, of the martyrdom of Christian virgins, combined with accounts of the putting to death of many virgins by the Huns, suggested the explanation. Suspicion was excited that the discoverers had composed the inscriptions for purposes of gain; but the Abbess ELIZABETH of Schönau (*vid. infra*), who was celebrated on account of her visions, received the desired revelation of the martyrdom of the 11,000 virgins. Her visions were subsequently supplemented with new revelations by the Premonstratensian Abbot RICHARD about 1183, and thus there grew up the detailed legend: *De passione sanctorum undecim millium virginum* (*vid. CROMBACH, Ursula vindicata*, Coloniae 1667, fo.). O. SCHADE thought to be able to demonstrate mythological elements in the legend, while otherwise it is supposed that the enormous number arose out of a misunderstanding of *undecim M. Virginum*, i.e. *martyrum virginum*. A rich store of relics came to the West from Constantinople at its conquest by the Latins (*vid. Riant Exuviae sacrae constantinopolitanae*, 2 vols., Geneva 1877, 78), in which case ecclesiastical dignitaries held robbery permissible. *Vid. Gualther. Paris. of Abbot Martin of Paris: indignum ducens sacrilegium, nisi in re sacra* (RIANT, I. 105).

The Church does not lack prudent protests against the impositions of the sellers and discoverers of relics who were interested in some sanctuary. Ecclesiastical assemblies (Poitiers in 1100, can. 12 and the **Fourth Lateran Council**, can. 62) and popes (Honorius III. in 1223 and Gregory IX.) took measures against such persons. Bishop WIBERT of Nogent, himself a zealous and even extravagant worshipper of the Virgin Mary and the saints, yet felt himself driven to raise a warning against the tangible abuse of credulity and assert more rational views.

He does not reckon the worship of relics among the customs necessary to salvation. Only the things as to which sure and credible tradition exists are to be regarded as holy. Even miracles, which are alleged to take place by means of relics are no unambiguous proof for the holiness of the persons from whom they proceed; Balaam's ass does not become a saint on account of its miraculous speech. He here also alludes to the miraculous gift of healing the king's evil ascribed to the French kings. Arbitrary fancies were made use of by representatives of the Church, in order that they might enjoy the pecuniary benefits which the credulous multitude spends on every relic. Wibert himself admits, that out of regard to the authority of the clergy, he had not dared to give the lie to a clerk, who appealed to him as to the genuineness of a relic (a piece of the bread of which Jesus had eaten). The common people, he said, ought not daily to procure new saints for every city and every village, as in antiquity new gods were constantly making their appearance, of whom finally some had to be put away. Old women at their spinning narrate fabulous stories of such new patron saints, and persecute with abusive words and their distaffs every one who would contradict them. In regard also to the relics of undoubted saints very many errors are met. The head of John the Baptist is said to be at Constantinople, and yet also with the monks at S. Jean d'Angely, etc. In general Wibert censures the abuse of removing the bodies of the saints from their resting places in the earth, in order to enclose them in costly vessels, and calls that to vie with God, but with want of understanding.

Wibert had doubted the genuineness of the **tooth of Christ**, which the

monks of the monastery of S. Medardus believed they possessed. Making mention of numerous similar relics (Christ's navel-string and foreskin) he attacked this whole species, because he said Christ had risen and been glorified with his whole body. Christ declared in the Lord's Supper that the body which sacramentally represented Him maintained His remembrance. But if miracles had really taken place by means of the alleged tooth of Christ, God might have conceded a miracle to the faith of Christians even though it were the tooth of another saint or any other person whatever.

With all the obvious effort in this treatise to meet and restrain the uncritical passion for relics and miracles of the age, it nevertheless shows how little an aversion on principle from the miracle-loving spirit of the age was intended, and how ineffectual on the whole such an effort necessarily remained.

This period much rather exhibits the constant growth of all sorts of **miracles**, with which faith saw itself surrounded everywhere. The most telling witnesses for this are the treatise of PETRUS VENERABILIS on the miracles of his time, and still more, that of CÆSARIUS of Heisterbach. Actual miracles are not only expected from the relics of the saints, but **living pious persons** also, who boast of special devotion and asceticism, are bold enough to undertake to perform miracles of every sort (healings and the like): Abelard indeed narrates ironically the attempt of S. NORBERT and his companion, to revive a dead man by prayers, when the failure was attributed by the pious men to the unbelief of the people present. At the same time in many cases a sceptical opinion glances out with greater insight, which, however, was unable to set a barrier to the popular love of miracle, and on the other hand, the clergy and monks are only too much inclined to strengthen the people in their belief in miracles and regard it as something pleasing to God, even when they themselves see deeper. The whole disposition to believe in miracles grew still further in the thirteenth century, and is enhanced to the utmost by the **begging-monks**. In the celebrated *Legenda aurea* of Jacobus de Voragine the entire chaos of crazy fables, whereby ecclesiastical authority avails itself of the services of the superstition of the age in its coarsest forms, is set down by predilection.

But it is in the **adoration of Mary** that the worship of the saints now reaches its culmination. About the beginning of this period Damiani already shows how ecstatic intensity and unrestrained phantasy see in her the tangible representative of the divine power for the redemption of men, and surrounds her with all the ardour of a sensuously coloured devotion. BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX says, that God desired that we should have everything through Mary.

"Christ is indeed given as mediator to sinful man recoiling in terror before God the Father; but the divine majesty of Christ also awes the sinner, and he therefore seeks an intercessor with Him; flee to Mary, whose pure humanity the Son also honours. The Son hears the Mother, the Father the Son; this ladder for the sinner is my whole hope."

In the **Mariale** (sermons on the feasts of Mary) the Cistercian Abbot Adam compares the mother of God as **virgo** (a rod out of the root of Jesse) with her son as the **axe** (which according to Luke is laid at the root). The rod strikes mercifully in order to improve, the axe strikes to annihilate in fury and wrath. Whoever does not allow himself to be improved by the former has to expect the latter (Ml. 211, 702). In the sermons of the Cistercian NICHOLAS, a contemporary of Bernard, which are to be found among those of Damiani, the deification of Mary, mingled with sensuous devotion, comes out most strongly. Mary is the perfectly deified creature, to whom nothing is impossible. She comes before the altar not as **maid**, but as **lady**. God stands, silent and perplexed on account of the Fall, in the midst of the angels; then Mary is born and grows up into a glorious marriageable virgin, whom God himself draws to himself, wooing her with the words of Psalm xlv. Burning for her with ardent love he sings the marriage-song (epithalamium), viz., the Song of Songs, in which he can no longer conceal his passion. Then in the council of the angels the decree of redemption is proclaimed, and the angel Gabriel commissioned: through Mary, in her and from her and with her the whole decree of redemption is to be carried out. According to the word of Gabriel the Virgin perceives *deum suis oblapsum visceribus*. *Vid.* in DAMIANI sermo 11; 40; 44, etc. Ml. 144, 557, 717, 736. The Song of Songs allegorically explained is the sensuous supersensuous expression of this devotion, into which RUPERT of Deutz, like so many others, plunges. The mountains of spices (Song of Songs viii. 14) are the saints, but Mary is the mountain of mountains, from which comes our help. This adoration of Mary appears in its most extravagant form in Bonaventura, to whom also, although erroneously, the so-called *Psalterium majus beatæ Mariæ virginis* is ascribed, in which the devotion of the psalmists is in travesty referred to Mary. The glory of Mary now resounds by predilection in the Latin hymns of the time, as well as in French and German poetry, especially in the minnesong of the thirteenth century, and in a specially outstanding fashion in the "*Goldener Schmiede*" of Conrad of Wurzburg († 1257).¹ The most devout and awe-inspiring elements are here blent in a very naive fashion with blunt sensualizing of the divine mystery. The visitation of Mary by the eternal Godhead is turned into a sweet love-mystery:

"'Twas love that made the Ancient young
Who was from evermore
From heaven above to earth he sprung
Mid our distresses sore," etc.

Accordingly, however, the worship of men for the Queen of Heaven entirely assumes the character of a knightly love-service. Monasticism pre-eminently devotes itself to this chaste service of love. The **Cistercians** in particular dedi-

¹ *Vid.* the edition by WILH. GRIMM, Berlin 1840, with its admirable explanations.

cate themselves to Mary in special devotion, all their churches are churches of S. Mary. Subsequently the Carmelites and the Servite monks come into a special relation to the mother of God, who in the course of the thirteenth century is represented as virgin beauty.

DAMIANI had already been most influential in determining the special form of the ecclesiastical worship of Mary. The song in praise of Mary began to receive a regular place in the daily service of the hours in chapters and monasteries, as did also those in praise of the Holy Cross and of all saints. Damiani composed a special **officium S. Mariæ**, i.e. certain prayers and hymns which were sung in the canonical hours.¹

This *cursus beatæ Mariæ* quickly naturalised itself in the monasteries, along with other attestations of devotion, such as the humble bowing of the knee or the head at her name, and the custom of fasting in honour of the Virgin Mary on all feast vigils and every **Saturday**. It was hoped that for the sake of this fasting Mary would procure a good end for her worshippers. The Council of Toledo of 1229, can. 25, prescribed attendance at church on Saturday evening to the laity *ob reverentiam beatæ Mariæ virginis*.

Popular piety was to be deeply permeated by the custom, which is already mentioned by Damiani, of addressing the Virgin with the Marian greeting **Ave Maria gratiæ plena** (Luke i. 28), which was soon regarded as recommended by the Virgin herself. Bishop Odo of Paris (end of the twelfth century) enjoined the priests to teach the people the Ave Maria, as well as the Lord's Prayer and the Creed. This custom became quite universal in the thirteenth century, and special devotion consisted in many times repeated daily prayer in these words. The Ave Maria was soon extended by the "*benedictus fructus ventris tui*," to which Urban IV. added the further words "*Jesus Christus. Amen.*" With the numerous repetitions of one and the same prayer, which was prescribed as a meritorious performance, there came in the use of the **Rosary**, recommended by the Dominicans, by means of which the number of aves and paternosters could be counted.

The feast "*festum immaculatæ conceptionis*" also owed its origin to the great enhancement of the worship of Mary. Actual sinlessness had already long been attributed to Mary, and indeed the conception had been advanced to that of her consecration in her mother's womb, but Anselm of Canterbury had strictly adhered to the view that Mary was born infected by original sin. Bernard of Clairvaux,² when **Canons** of the church of **Lyons** had advanced to the notion of her immaculate conception in her

¹ *Vid.* Ml. 148, 955.

² *Epist.* 174, *ad canonicos Lugdunenses*.

mother's womb (1140), censured this as an objectionable innovation.

Appealing to Biblical analogies (Jer. i. 5; Luke i. 41), he fell back on the notion of the consecration of the child in its mother's womb, without desiring to decide how far this *sanctificatio in utero* proved effectual against the original sin implanted by generation. For he maintained that Mary had formerly been holy, before she was born, hence her birthday was celebrated by the whole Church, as again her whole life had been free from sin; but if it was desired to go back to the conception, it would be necessary on account of this miracle to celebrate feasts for her parents and so further back. The appeal to a vision for confirmation Bernard would not admit, as being untrustworthy. Other theologians also of the twelfth century took their stand on Bernard's opposition to the innovation. In the thirteenth century the *festum conceptionis Mariæ* is often mentioned in lists of feasts, and the Council of Oxford in 1222, can. 8, restricted itself to the remark that the celebration of this feast was not necessary. On the other hand the General Council of the Franciscans declared in favour of it in 1263. Nevertheless the Feast of the Conception is not here invariably expressly designated *festum immaculatæ conceptionis*, hence DURANTI will not regard the *immaculata conceptio*, but only the fact of the conception of the Mother of God as the ground of the celebration of the feast, since Mary, like all mankind, was *in peccato concepta*.

Thomas still emphatically opposed the doctrine. It is only at the close of this period that DUNS SCOTUS undertakes what is still a pretty moderate justification of it, which then became the distinctive scholastic doctrine of the Scotists.

Finally, it was in accordance with the practical ascendancy of the cult of Mary, that men should in theory indeed guard against paying to Mary **divine** adoration (*adoratio latriæ*), but should ascribe to her, in distinction from the reverence (*dulia*) due to all the other saints, a *hyperdulia*, which Thomas expressly designated an intermediate degree between *dulia* and *latria*.¹

While hitherto the bishops in many cases had still exercised the right of **canonisation** for their dioceses, Alexander III., taking occasion by a vexatious procedure in a French monastery, laid exclusive claim for the popes to the right of deciding. Hence developed a ceremonious process at the establishment of the merits of the saints concerned (process of canonisation).

Alexander III. also exercised this right in many cases, and for the most part not among popular saints and martyrs of an ascetic character, but among such

¹ The expression *hyperdulia* is first found in Petrus Lombardus for the worship which is due to the human nature of Christ, which is connected with his inclination towards the Adoptionist separation of the two natures in Christ, while, following the traces of more correct ecclesiastical Christology, it was necessary to avoid this and allow the adoration of the humanity of Christ to coincide with that of the Eternal Word.

as had merited reward by ecclesiastical services, as in the cases of the younger Cnut of Denmark, THOMAS BECKET (1173), BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX (1174) and others. The meritorious episcopal missionary OTTO of Bamberg was canonised by Clement III. in 1189, similarly the accomplished Bishop BERNWARD of Hildesheim and the ascetic founder of the Order of VALLOMBROSO. The Emperor HENRY II., who had already been canonised by Pope Eugenius III., was now also followed in this honour under Innocent III. by his wife CUNIGUNDE. In the thirteenth century the number of these new saints was extraordinarily increased. Very speedily the founders and heads of the mendicant orders, DOMINIC, FRANCIS, ANTONY of Padua, CLARA of Assisi, etc. were canonised, similarly the monastic ideal of Christian feminine virtue, S. ELIZABETH of Thuringia. The steps towards the canonisation of LEWIS IX. of France began immediately after his death, but only led to the desired end after long investigations and negotiations, in 1297, under Boniface VIII.

The **ecclesiastical celebration of the saints** acquires a very wide-reaching importance for divine worship among the people. The celebration of their days was proclaimed in church, and sermons on saints occupy a large space in the sermonic literature of the day. The visitation of the churches consecrated to their relics, bestows a special importance on the celebrations of the dedication of Churches and in part grows into largely attended pilgrimages. As in the Mass men find support in the merit and intercession of the saints, so at other times they are appealed to as favourite intercessors with God, and special exercises of prayer and ecclesiastical good works are dedicated to them. The disposition, which was already ancient, to ascribe to definite saints the power of certain kinds of benefits, is now fortified in the conception of the so-called **helpers-in-need**, usually numbering fourteen, as special patrons in special needs (S. Florian for distress of fire, S. Margaret for pregnancy, S. Nicholas for seafarers, and more of the like).

Confession and the System of Indulgence.

Sources : PSEUDO-AUGUSTINUS, *De vera et falsa penitentia* in AUGUSTINI opp. ed. Bened. Antw. 1700 sqq. Tom. vi., 717; almost entirely included in GRATIAN'S *Decretum* (II. caus. qu. 3) and in PETRI LOMB. *Sententiæ*. RICHARDI a S. Vict. *de potestate ligandi et solvendi* Ml. 196, 1159; RAYMUNDI DE PENNAFORTE, *Summa de penitentia*, Rom. 1603, Aven. 1715. The treatment of the point of doctrine in all the School-men from HUGO A S. VICT. onwards.—*Literature* : vid. p. 217.

The hierarchical development of the Church necessarily led to the giving of a growing importance to **confession** as the real bridle by means of which the laity were guided by the priesthood, both as regards the **extension of the obligation of confession** and as regards the **conception of the inner nature of confession and absolution**. The manipulation of ecclesiastical discipline had its support on the one hand in the judicial procedure of the synodal

courts (*vid. supra*), on the other hand in the fact that apart from this procedure, the Church also inculcated the duty of confessing public and notorious sins to the priest, in order that he might impose the requisite penances.

For the treatment of open sinners, who were convicted and submitted themselves to the penitential procedure of the Church, the ancient custom was maintained of the solemn procedure by the bishop at the **beginning of Lent**, in presence of the deans, archpriests and priests of penance, when those who had accepted penance (*qui publicam suscipiunt aut susceperunt pœnitentiam*) prostrated themselves contritely in front of the church in sackcloth and ashes in presence of the bishop, were then amid penitential singing in the church itself declared by the bishop to be excluded from the church, and were led out by the doorkeeper, only to find solemn re-admission after making atonement during the fasting season and in certain circumstances under further obligation to perform longer penance.

The Church always pressed with increasing urgency the point that all who were secretly conscious of a so-called mortal sin, should submit themselves to **confession** before the **priest**; in fact, apart from the case of plainly mortal sin, the Church began to recommend general confession to the priest, but in doing so still met with much resistance.

DAMIANI (Ml. 144, 897 sq.) complains that the power of confession is still hidden from so many, and HUGO OF S. VICTOR in his recommendation of confession quotes the words of the laity: where does Scripture command us to confess our sins? In the formula of general confession and absolution, given by HONORIUS of Autun in the *Speculum ecclesiæ* (Ml. 172, 824), a safeguard is appended to the formula of absolution, to the effect that this confession in public worship (the so-called **public confession**) only avails those who have already confessed to the priest or, for the rest, only for those sins which have been unconsciously committed; for those persons, however, who have committed capital sins and have not yet confessed them, *i.e.* those sins for which the solemn penitential procedure of the periods of fasting (*carena*, *vid.* the annotation on Ml. l.c.) was appointed, the advice is given to submit themselves to the priest before they come to the Lord's Table, in order that they may not become guilty of the Lord's body. In the formula of confession itself prayer is made for God's *clementia* and delay in which to make amends (*emendare*) "in order that I may gain his grace (*gratia*)," and the absolution itself is expressed by way of deprecation. Quite similarly we find it in German books of sermons,¹ where the formula of absolution, in a deprecatory form, expresses forgiveness of sins and respite for true and fruitful penance, as is prayed in the confession of sin, that the saints should assist in obtaining from God, "that I should receive so long respite in this life, till I can rightly repent for my sins and do penance, in order that the grace of God may release me from my sins," etc. And also where in this case the absolution is uttered with express appeal to the priestly power of the keys, the expression is however: "So speak I also the sacred words, which

¹ *Vid.* KELLE, *Speculum ecclesiæ*, 1858, p. 7. Cf. LINSSEN-MAYER, l.c. p. 140 sqq. and the comparison of passages in CRUEL l.c. p. 223.

may God in His goodness fulfil, the remission and forgiveness of all your sins and prolongation of your life for true repentance and amendment."

This procedure at the so-called public profession of guilt at divine service throws light on the development of the system of confession proper, which now comes more definitely under the idea of the sacrament. In this connection the following points come under consideration: (1) **The formula of absolution** remains **deprecatory** till after the beginning of the thirteenth century, and in it therefore the priestly mediation is only conceived as mediatorial intercession, to which also the formulæ of confession correspond (*ut intercedas pro me et pro peccatis meis ad dominum*). Peter the Lombard still declares that "God alone binds or looses sins." The priest's power of the keys therefore signifies the *postestas ostendi homines ligatos vel solutos*; one who is loosed before God is regarded as loosed in the view of the Church only by the declared judgment of the priest.¹ But already in the pseudo-Augustinian tractate **De vera et falsa pœnitentia**, which became of such great ecclesiastical importance, the view that the priest's forgiveness was God's forgiveness had found effective expression.² Hence (2) arises the entirely decisive weight which is now laid upon **confession before the priest**. Gratian discusses, whether absolution is to be obtained from God by brokenness of heart and secret satisfaction even without confession by the mouth, as still an open question, and finds non-decisive the reasons given for the theory that even secret sins must necessarily be confessed to the priest that they may be atoned for according to his decision. (3) Practically the question was specially related to the further question of **which** sins in general were to be confessed.

LANFRANC had still limited the necessity of confessing to the priest and receiving absolution from him to **public** sins; secret sins were only to be confessed to some cleric, or in the absence of such to another pure man, or in case of necessity only to God Himself. PETER the Lombard still hesitates whether any one can obtain release from sins without satisfaction and confession and solely by penitent contrition, and whether it is sufficient, say, to confess to a layman, but was inclined to the decision that one must confess

¹ Cf. PETRUS PICTAV. *sentent.* III., 16 (Ml. 211, 1073 sqq.): to the priest falls the declaration of the divine forgiveness of sins which has taken place (the *ostendere*), the imposition or remission of the ecclesiastical penalty, finally the imposition or abolition of ecclesiastical excommunication.—A very noteworthy discussion in ADAMI abb. Perseniæ *epp. ad abbatem de Vernusia*, ep. 26 (Ml. 211, 692 sqq.): "Lazarus was raised up by the Lord, but at His command loosed from his bandages by the disciples."

² The tractate under the weighty name of Augustine found admission into **Gratian's Decree** and almost entirely into the sentences of the Lombard.

first to God and then to the priest in order to gain entrance into Paradise. The omission of confession before the priest can only be excused in cases of necessity. The laity are now exhorted to frequent confession even of sins which have remained secret, and confession before a layman is only declared sufficient as a necessity on the ground of God's mercy. The pseudo-Augustinian tractate, however, asserts that in such cases help is not so quickly given as through priestly absolution. The **sacramental character of confession** is still ascribed by ALBERT the Great to necessary confession before a layman.

It now becomes an effective principle, that by the very confession before the priest, the sin, which in itself was a mortal sin, is reduced to a venial one, which can now be atoned for by the works of penance imposed.¹ But finally Innocent III. at the Fourth Lateran Council, can. 21, gave the precept that all believers, so soon as they had reached the age of discretion, should be held to confess **all** their sins to their regular priest at least once a year, in order that he might impose the satisfactions upon them. By this means it was intended to oppose an important weapon to the dangerous threatening of the Church by the sects (Albigenses). Those who contravened were threatened with exclusion from the Church and the refusal of Christian burial. Confession was only to be made to a strange priest with the permission of the ordinary pastor, a regulation which indeed was immediately limited by the privileges conferred upon the mendicant orders. At the same time prudent procedure and careful investigation of all the circumstances, and the conscientious guarding of the **secrecy of confession**, on the breaking of which the penalty of deposition and permanent cloistral confinement was imposed, were inculcated on the priests. These ordinances of the general council had an essential share in determining the further scholastic conception of confession.

THOMAS still recognised, that according to **divine** law confession was obligatory for those only who had fallen into mortal sin after baptism, as only for them was confession necessary for salvation;² but according to **positive ecclesiastical** law, all were obliged to confess before the priest on account of the ecclesiastical precept mentioned. In consequence of this the person who has nothing else to confess, must even confess venial sins. Confession and absolution set free from eternal punishment; but man remains subject to the *pœna temporalis* as the means of salvation and purification, a penalty which, so far

¹ *Fît per confessionem veniale, quod criminale erat in operatione sive mortale.*

² Cf. **Compilatio de novo spiritu** (from the Passau Anonymus about 1260 in PREGER, *G. d. Myst.*, I. 461 sq., 409): *Quod dicitur, Confessionem venialiorum non esse necessariam, verum est, sed non dicendum, quia licet non est necessaria, tamen perutilis est, cum de talibus dicatur, quod bonarum mentium est ibi culpam agnoscere, ubi culpa non est, veniale enim culpa non est, sed dispositio ad culpam.*

as it is not worked out by means of the satisfactions of penance, is still to be suffered in purgatory. The gloss on the tractate *De pœnitentia* in Gratian's Decree still declares oral confession to rest upon a universal ecclesiastical tradition, but not on the authority of Scripture. For this reason, it is said, it is necessary in the Latin Church in cases of mortal sin, but among the Greeks not so, as such a tradition was not current among them. The precept of Jas. v. 16, had merely the character of an evangelical counsel, as otherwise it would also have bound the Greeks. On the other hand BONAVENTURA now declares the older opinion, that it was sufficient to confess to God, to be heretical, which formerly, before the decision of Innocent III., it had not been, so far as it was not the priest's *potestas clavium* in itself, but only the unconditional necessity of confession to the priest which had been denied.

The view still maintained by Peter the Lombard, that priestly absolution only showed forth the forgiveness granted by God had already been declared frivolous and ludicrous by RICHARD OF S. VICTOR,¹ who grounded upon Hugo's opinion. The priest, he said, had the *potestas remittendi* in regard to releasing from the penalty, but it remained in God's hands to release from guilt by the inpouring of the divine grace; an opinion which, fundamentally, was not far removed from that above-mentioned (p. 338 sq.). On the other hand Thomas thought it necessary to adhere to the notion that the power of the keys co-operated in the forgiveness of the guilt, but not as *principale agens*, but as *instrumentale*. God alone forgives guilt through Himself; but the priest works as His instrument and, indeed, as absolution by the priest must still be inevitably necessary, in such a way that it places the confessor in the frame of mind to receive forgiveness (disposes him towards it). On the other hand in absolution part of the *reatus pœnæ* remains, in respect of which the imposition of penance must then take place.

Corresponding to the transformation in the doctrine is the fact that the deprecatory formula of absolution, which was still maintained and confirmed by Bishop William of Paris (1217), now drops out and is replaced by the **indicative** formula.

Thomas gives the reason of this by saying that in the deprecatory formula the absolution itself does not take place but is only prayed for. He appeals to the fact that the sacramental absolution also is preceded by a prayer of the same kind in order that the effect of the sacrament may not in any way be hindered on the part of the person confessing. Finally this theory involves that the priest alone in virtue of his ordination can absolve, and therefore confession is to be made to him only. In accordance with the limitation which is also made in the case of other sacraments, according to which, in case of forcible hindrance, a lively desire to enjoy the sacrament may afford a substitute for its actual reception, Thomas also acknowledges that in case of imperative necessity confession to a layman may have a certain sacramental character,² since here, what is requisite on the part of the person confessing is present (*contritio* and *confessio*), while the defect on the part of the administrator of the sacrament is supplemented by Christ, the *summus sacerdos*. Bonaventura declares confession to a layman a mere make-shift for the sacrament. Duns Scotus finally ex-

¹ Tractatus de potestate ligandi et solvendi, cap. 12.

² Albertus Magnus had still exactly designated confession to a layman as sacramentalis.

presses himself in general as doubtful as to the utility of such confession. But examples of such cases are not wanting in the thirteenth century (GIESELER, II. 2, 500).

The more generally the value of confession before the priest was accentuated and at the same time the ancient solemn form of public exercise of repentance fell back and was only employed in glaring cases, so much the more must the tendency in private procedure have increased, to proceed gently and with regard to personal circumstances in the **imposition of the exercises of penance** (satisfactions), and therefore very essentially to mitigate the rigour of the ancient ecclesiastical canons of penance according as it might seem good to the priest.¹

ROBERT of Flammesbury indeed adhered to the standard of the canons of penance, but most decidedly advised that they should be mitigated in practice. The responsibility therefor, he said, had not to be borne by the person confessing (he is saved if he is only ready to accept even the strict penance), but only by the penitential priest. RAYMUNDUS DE PENNAFORTE distinguishes the opinion that the prescribed canonical form is only to be varied from in the way of mitigation or aggravation in accordance with regard to the special circumstances, from the other opinion that all penances are only to be imposed as may seem good (*arbitrarias*). The former procedure is to him the surer but the more difficult, but the other corresponds to actual custom.

A noteworthy phenomenon appears in the moral judgment of offences in so far as Robert of Flammesbury asserts, in accordance with the view of the Roman legal experts, that in purely legal matters, legal permissibility affords the standard for moral admissibility also, and therefore that what is legally (according to civil law) permitted and compatible with the spirit of the law, must also be judged as allowed in the sphere of conscience (and therefore in confession before the priest). On the contrary Raymundus de Pennaforte and with him the majority of the canonists, hold that the principles of civil law only decide in those cases for which the canon law contains no regulations.

But above all the Church's seriousness as to penance is now opposed and hindered by the already long practised custom of **buying off or compensating for exercises of penance with money**. Peter of Poitiers finds this quite cheap in penance for secret sins; and in practice this is the custom to the widest extent according to ancient usage, so that **in many cases the performance of penance actually assumes the character of fines**.

Abelard censures the avarice of the priests, who do not observe **quid velit dominus**, but **quid valeat nummus**. He also complains that bishops at consecrations of churches and other festal occasions, when rich offerings are expected from the streaming together of the multitude, issue remissions, present every one without distinction with the third or fourth part of the penalties of penance and, appealing to the power of the keys, extol this as special clemency,

¹ *Vid.* Pseudo-Calixtus II. *Sermo I. in St. Jacobum*.

as though this were their concern. Here we have also a glimpse of the idea that God alone can forgive sins. Thus, when on occasion of the laying of the foundation-stone of a church (1156), the bishop issued letters with copious indulgences, a certain Abbot Stephen refused to take part in this proceeding, because what God alone could give was being extolled as an act of human beneficence: "We are still oppressed by our own sins, how can we take away the burden from others?" (GIESELER, II. 2, 505, note). Other ecclesiastical opinions place this on the same level with what otherwise is regarded as simony, *e.g.* that they willingly take money in atonement for breaking the peace of God, instead of requiring repentance from the sinner.¹

In order that the keys of the Church might not be despised and the satisfactions of penance enfeebled, Innocent III. still sought to attach modifying limits to the universal custom of the bishops of issuing indulgences to the attendants upon the consecration of churches and such like occasions. But the practice which the bishops pursued on the small scale, the popes undertook on the large. Gregory VI., in 1044, had promised all who contributed to the restoration of Roman churches, that he and his successors would celebrate masses for them three times a year in all the Roman churches. It was worse when Gregory VII. afforded the example which was so frequently followed, of granting forgiveness of sins in virtue of his supreme authority to all the adherents of RUDOLPH of Swabia (Rheinfelden) the opponent of Henry IV. As in this case the power of the keys was placed at the service of ecclesiastical politics, so at the Synod at Clermont in 1095 Urban II. promised all who should take the cross out of devotion and not from ambition or greed of gain, full remission of all penances imposed on them, and Alexander III. in his crusading bull promised at least a part. Innocent III. would have had the amount of the remission determined according to the greatness of the gift and especially according to the degree of devotion. In the case of these promises, which were frequently repeated during the crusades, it was certainly presupposed that confession had previously taken place, and for the most part this was expressly made a condition, as the indulgence was only to replace the satisfactions in the sacrament of penance. All who fell in the crusades were to be regarded as martyrs of Christ. Loudly advertising preachers of the crusades boasted (especially when the fire of enthusiasm threatened to burn out) that the greatest criminals, as soon as they laid hold of the cross, were loosed from crime and penalty and that their souls would immediately soar up to heaven in case of their death during this enterprise. By such

¹ There is a noteworthy passage on this subject in Pseudo-Calixtus II.'s *sermo I. in Jacobum*, Ml. 163, 1387 sqq.

tangible nourishment of spiritual security they promoted the quickly swelling tide of immorality and dissoluteness among the crusaders, which besides was already strengthened by the violent movements which released men from all customary moral restraints and exposed them to the wildest temptations.

Theological theory exerted itself to bring the authority of the Church into harmony with the voice of conscience by prudent limitation of the power which was ascribed to ecclesiastical indulgences. Appeal was made to the power of alms to blot out sins, which was universally acknowledged by the ecclesiastical system,¹ and therefore the corresponding performance was looked upon as a pious work to a good end, the power of which was strengthened by the authority of the Church and its intercessions offered therefor; or, it is not hesitated to call the promise of indulgences a pious fraud, whereby the Church makes believers favourable to good ecclesiastical purposes. "In truth the prelates promise much which is not performed." The mediatorial significance of the ecclesiastical priesthood leads to the conception that in confession the Church effects the forgiveness of sins by its prayers, whence it is concluded that it is so much the more powerful to effect the remission of the lesser matter, the penalty. It is likewise sought to limit the promises of the popes to the crusaders to the mere intercessions of the Church.

But the mischief which was confusing consciences went on assuming greater extent. In the conflict of the Pope against Manfred of Sicily complete indulgence was extended to all who supported the Pope with money. The Franciscans, appealing to an alleged concession granted to their founder by Pope Honorius gained indulgence for visitors of the church of Portiuncula, and more of the like. The Jubilee indulgence² issued by BONIFACE VIII. for the year 1300, for all who attended S. Peter's Church for fourteen days, is to quite peculiarly be regarded as extortion; certainly here also confession is made a condition, so that, **formally**, the point of view is maintained that there is only question of the remission of ecclesiastical penalties.

One product of this system of indulgencies is formed by the so-called **penny-preachers**, against which nuisance, as one which had recently arisen, BERTHOLD of Ratisbon urgently declaims. "The penny-preacher lies, saying that he has power from the Pope to take away all thy sins for a *hölbling* or a *heller*." Synods, such as the Provincial Council of Mayence in 1261, can. 41, were obliged to take steps against this pest, by which the system of indulgences was utilized in a crafty way. In the interest of the ecclesiastically recognised indulgences, i.e. when a church has resolved to gain alms by means of indulgences, it was

¹ PAULUS PRESBYTER, *Summa de penitentia*.

² *Extravagantes communes*, V. 9, 1.

necessary to find protection against these fraudulent *quæstuarii*. Under Urban IV. in 1262 the Inquisition was obliged to take steps against such persons, and from the complaints of Humbertus de Romanis in the *proponenda* for the Council of 1274 it is plain that these penny-preachers knew how to bribe prelates and priests, so as to gain protection for themselves and their coarse fraud.

In the scholastic vindication of indulgences, Albertus Magnus and Thomas have still to reject as reprehensible the opinion that the indulgences had in reality no power, but were to be regarded as pious frauds to a supposed good end (*vid. supra*). But on the other hand, it is necessary to emphasize the conditions, to which tacitly or expressly the power of the indulgences is attached. They accordingly refer only under presupposition of repentance and confession,¹ to the satisfactions which are to be imposed by the Church, *i.e.* the temporal penalties which were to be offered, which remain, after, by the sacrament of penance, mortal sins have been turned into venial. The indulgences granted therefore abolish the obligation to undergo the remaining temporal penalties, and accordingly have also the effect, that those on whom indulgence is conferred can be withdrawn entirely or in part from the penalty of purgatory, as also that indulgence which has been procured by believers may also benefit departed souls in purgatory.

In accordance with the **entirely mechanical conception of the traffic in indulgences**, it was now sought to find an **equivalent**, by the application of which the remission of the performance which was due could be compensated. Such an instrument was now found, whereas hitherto the intercession of the Church which interfered on behalf of the debtor had been regarded as sufficient, in the so-called **surplus treasure of the merits of Christ and the Saints**, of which by virtue of the mystical unity of the body of Christ, the Church, *i.e.* the Pope, had authority to dispose, so that for good and pious ends he could permit compensation. The theory was perfected by THOMAS AQUINAS, especially in regard to the extension of indulgence to souls in Purgatory. As regards this point the difficulty consisted in the fact that there was necessarily hesitation in allowing the spiritual jurisdiction of the Church to be stretched beyond the limits of this life. It was possible to suppose that a Christian, who had died with sincere signs of repentance, but who had been overtaken by death before he had received the Church's absolution, would be regarded before God as absolved, and that he, therefore, only required further that the Church should expressly confer absolution upon him. But such an assertion involved nothing as to what the person concerned might still have to suffer in the way of temporal penalties in purgatory. As the deceased person was now removed from the spiritual forum of the Church, people fell back upon the fact that the Church was accustomed to pray for the salvation of the dead, and assumed that the indulgences for satisfactions not yet rendered would benefit the souls in Purgatory, not indeed in consequence of a judicial utterance of the Church, but in consequence of the intercession of the Church which was to be pre-supposed as operative (**per modum suffragii**.)

¹ In practice, the conception, which as a matter of fact was frequently formed, was very obvious, that the *contriti et confessi*, who were to benefit by indulgence, were simply those persons who had not omitted the **Easter auricular confession** imposed since the time of Innocent III.

THIRD PERIOD.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

The Development of Monasticism down to Innocent III.

Sources: MABILLON, *AS. sæc. V. et. VI.*—*Literature*: MABILLON, *Annales* and the literature i. 21 under Nr. 6; GIESELER, II. 2, 299 sqq.

1. **The older orders.** *Sources*: Clugny *vid. sup.* p. 189; *Biblioth. Cluniacensis* by M. Marrier and Quercetanus, P. 1614; **Hirschau**: *Codex Hirsaugiensis* in BLV. I.—*Literature*: WILKENS, *Petrus d. Ehrw.*, Lpz. 1857; KERKER, *Wilh. d. Selige*, Tüb. 1863; HELMSDÖRFER, *Forschungen z. G. des Abt. W.*, Gött. 1874; GISEKE, *die Hirschauer während des Investiturstr.*, Gött. 1883; GIESEBRECHT, *Kaiserg.*, III. 1, 632 sqq. (*vid.* 4th ed.); WTTB. II. 36–38.

THE Benedictine congregation of the **Cluniacs** (p. 190) especially on into the twelfth century, as it spread more widely and grew richer, further exercised its most highly influential agency in the sense of Gregorian ecclesiastical reform, not only in France, where all of the nobility who strove after higher culture and were filled with the ideals of the Church passed under their influence, but also elsewhere. In Germany, Abbot WILLIAM of HIRSCHAU (1069–1091) specially took up the spirit of Clugny; in 1077 he introduced the Cluniac Rule into his monastery, and, as a reformer in this sense, influenced numerous monasteries of South Germany, as far as Switzerland and Austria on the one side, and Saxony and Thuringia on the other, although the spread of the Rule of Hirschau did not lead to the formation of an actual **congregation** under the presidency of Hirschau. As in Clugny pretty early, so also in **Hirschau** we find the practice, which was of so great consequence for the further development of monasticism, viz. the **admission of lay-brothers** (*fratres conversi, barbati*) into the monastic society itself. They not only, like the former adopted servants of the monasteries, attended to external services, but were themselves subject to the Rule and participated in the religious merits of the order, but in consideration of the external business matters incumbent on them, enjoyed greater freedom. This institution is already found in the case of Gualbert of Vallombrosa (p. 192). In the last decades of the eleventh century it was reinforced by the thronging in of a great number of the awakened laity, even among men of rank.¹

¹ UHLHORN, *Liebesthätigkeit im M.A.*, p. 96–99.

The ecclesiastical efforts after reform, such as were cherished in Hirschau, also made these monasteries in Germany foci of anti-national opposition in the controversy over investiture. And in the victorious league with the Gregorian papacy, in the effort after a position of ecclesiastical power and independence, they were as little secured as the older Benedictines against the fate of secularisation, which was further promoted by the inclination, since the time of Gregory VII., to bestow **exemptions** and favours of various sorts on outstanding monasteries, or even on whole orders. Complete exemption from the diocesan bishop, and complete spiritual jurisdiction over the churches of the monastic properties, remained comparatively rare; but the monasteries, not seldom on the ground of falsified documents, at least obtained and aspired after considerable privileges and greater independence. The episcopal insignia were also probably bestowed on abbots. The monasteries acquired parishes (*vid. sup.* p. 317), and thus the favouring of the monasteries turned out to the ruin of ecclesiastical order. The Fourth Lateran Council had to censure the interference of abbots with the episcopal government of the Church.

In the case of Clugny itself, the deterioration, which was promoted by the distinction and favour conferred on it by the popes, made its appearance under Abbot PONTIUS (1109-25), a young relation of Pope Paschal II. Clugny had given a brilliant reception to Pope Gelasius II., and again to Calixtus II.; but relaxed discipline and extravagant splendour called forth great offence under Pontius.

Pontius evaded the attempt of the Bishop of Macon to take proceedings against this scandal at a provincial synod, by appealing to the fact that Clugny was only subject to the Pope. Complaints against him, which reached Rome from Clugny itself, caused Pontius to resign to Calixtus II., and vow a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Contrition and arrogant ambition conflicted in this man. In the Holy Land he hoped to attain a bishopric as compensation; then, however, he returned to France, spreading about him the appearance of sanctity, and, with the help of the nobles who had been drawn into his interest and his own party among the monks, surprised and seized the monastery, which was plundered and the whole territory of which was devastated by his adherents. Pope Honorius issued the ban against Clugny and deposed Pontius as a robber, sacrilegist and schismatic, while Pontius boasted that he could only be excommunicated by S. Peter in heaven.

PETER THE VENERABLE, one of the noblest representatives of the good spirit of Clugny, now ruled as the establisher of discipline and order in Clugny; he made order and strictness the rule, though not without traits of a more liberal cordiality of spirit, according to the saying of S. Augustine, "only have love and do as thou wouldst."

He further exercised a very important influence on the Church and popes of his time, although the rising star of the great Bernard of Clairvaux threatened to put him in the shade.

New forms of culture arose out of the powerful religious movement of the time, its contrition, as glowing enthusiasm. Partly, abrupt abandonment of ungovernable sensuality and rude violence, partly pious aversion from the secularised clerical career, partly also, probably, flight from the temptations of speculation, drove men into the silence of the monastery, and at the same time filled the latter in its turn with the force of practical ecclesiastical activity; in this respect, France, which ecclesiastically was so much alive, showed itself specially fruitful.

2. Order of Grammont. *Sources:* GERARDI *vita S. Stephani* in MARTÈNE et DUR. *ampliss. Collectio*, VI. 1050. The *Historia brevis Priorum Grandimontens.*, and the *Hist. proluxior*, *ibid.* p. 117, 126. *Conventio inter clericos et conversos grandimontens.*, MARTÈNE, *Thesaur. nov. anecd.*, I. 630.

STEPHEN of TIGERNO, the son of a count in Auvergne, came as a boy on pilgrimage with his father to Italy, and while with his countryman, Archbishop Stephen of Benevento, already showed his anchorite inclinations. From 1076, in his home, a number of strict ascetics gathered about him, from among whom he formed at **Muret** near Limoges a society, which subsequently, after Stephen's death, established its seat in the neighbouring **Grammont**. Hence arose the **Order of Grammont**. The only rule which they acknowledged was that of the Gospel, viz., that of poverty, humility, and endurance without dispute. Subsequently the need of a fixed rule was felt.¹

According to the principle of poverty the monastery was to possess no lands or churches, keep no cattle and take no money for masses. No secular persons were to be admitted to their Sunday services. In case of want, support was to be asked from the bishop; in case of extreme necessity, but only after fasting for several days, members were to seek it by begging. The settlements of the order, which quickly spread in Aquitaine, Anjou and Normandy, were to stand under the priorate of Grammont.

With the growth of the Order, which was unable to maintain its original stringency, controversies arose between the **lay** monks, who regarded themselves as the legitimate leaders of the monasteries, and the clerical members, who strove after decisive influence. Alexander III. and other popes were obliged to interfere as mediators. According to Urban III. the abbot, who was to be elected by the laymen and clerics, was to manage the *spiritualia* along with the clerics, the *temporalia* along with the *conversi*. With a view

¹ According to MABILLON first under the seventh prior, Gerard, the biographer of Stephen, about 1188.

to necessary reforms, Gregory IX. was obliged to commission Carthusian and Cistercian monks to take part in the general chapters of the Order. Further changes in the Order were effected by Innocent IV.

3. Carthusians. *Sources*: GUIBERTI abb. de Novigento, *de vita sua*, I. 11 (Ml. 156); ASB. Oct. iii., 491; *Cartusianæ consuetudines* in MAB. *AS. Ben. sæc. VI.*, p. II. *præfatio*.

BRUNO of COLOGNE, scholasticus in the cathedral chapter of Rheims, and as such the teacher of the subsequent Pope Urban II., also chancellor of the archbishopric, being roused to anger by the unspiritual and fretful life of his archbishop, the violent Manasse I. (who was afterwards deposed at Lyons in 1080, and excommunicated by Gregory VII.), retired to a wild cavern in the mountains near Grenoble. A number of monks living in single cells form the root of his order. Strict life and scanty clothing, and almost complete silence, as well as the principle of accepting no landed property, except the bit of ground beside their cells, distinguish from the beginning, the life of these **Carthusians**. Drawn to Rome after a few years, by Pope Urban II., Bruno finally fled again into solitude, and founded a monastery in **Calabria**, where he died in 1101. The Order of the Carthusians combined anchoritism with the form of cœnobitism, in so far as the common monastery included within itself a multitude of single cells, in which the monks, two by two, were to dwell together in unbroken silence. On Saturday only did they assemble and converse and confess to the prior. Under scanty nourishment their time was filled up with manual labour, devotion, and the copying of books. At first the order actually refused foundations, but this did not last long. The statutes of 1258, confirmed at the general chapter of 1259, complain of deviations from the rules, and the creeping in of insubordination and worldliness. It was resolved to refuse all further acquirements of property. But the monasteries had already become extensive settlements, as is shown by the regulation that no Charter House should have more than 1,200 sheep or goats, sixty cows, six fattened oxen, and sixteen stallions. The care of agriculture was assigned to the **lay-brethren** admitted. In spite of the growth of their wealth, which led to the building of splendid monasteries and churches, on the whole the Carthusian monks distinguished themselves by their strict manner of life and widely-exercised beneficence.

4. The Order of Fontévrault. *Sources*: BALDRICUS, Abbas Burguliensis, *Vita Roberti* in ASB., Feb. v., 593.

ROBERT of Arbrissel (in Brittany, in the diocese of Rennes), a priest of Hildebrandine tendency, zealously active in the reform of

the clergy as vicar of his bishop, subsequently utilized by Urban II. as a preacher of penance and the crusade, had, from as early as 1094, lived as a strict hermit, in the wood of Craon, surrounded by many like-minded persons, but had afterwards founded an abbey (de la Roë) of regular canons. But about 1100 he founded a combination of several monasteries at Fontévrard (Fons Ebraldi) not far from Saumur in Upper Poitou. The exuberant veneration of the **Virgin Mary**, and at the same time Robert's great power over the minds of women, here brought about the peculiar institution by which the abbess of the **nunnery** at Fontévrard, as the visible representative of the mother of God, was placed at the head of the whole foundation; even the monks of the monastery with their abbot were to be subjected to her, as the Apostle John had served the Virgin Mary. In addition there was an **hospital for the sick** and a **foundation for Magdalenes**; a common church was to unite them all. The founder, a man of great devotion and compassionate love, was nevertheless obliged to hear the reproach that he was in the perilous position of too great intimacy with his female associates.¹ His order, which in immediately subsequent times attained great prosperity in France, but was less spread beyond it, was confirmed by Paschal II. in 1106, and in 1113 was directly subordinated to the Pope. It bore the character of a strict order of penance, and was prohibited from receiving parish churches and tithes.

5. **The Cistercians.** *Relatio qualiter incipit O. Cist.*, the so-called *Exordium parvum* in AUB. MIRÆUS, *Chronic. Cist. Ordinis*, Col. Agr. 1614. The so-called **Exordium magnum** by Conrad of Eberbach († 1226) in TISSIER, *Bibl. ord. Cist.*, I. 13-246; *Statuta selecta capit. general. O.C.* in MARTÈNE ET DUR., *nov. thesaur. anecdot.*, IV. Other material in MANRIQUE, *Annales Cisterc.*, Lugd. 1642; HENRIQUEZ, *Regula, constitutiones et privil. O.C.*, Antw. 1630, and in WINTER, *die Cisterzienser des nordöstl. Deutschlands*, 3 vols. Gött. 1868 sqq.—*Literature*: the above-mentioned works and P. de NAIN, *Essai sur l'hist. de l'ordre de Cîteaux*, Par. 1696, 9 vols.; JANAUSCHEK, *Origines Cist.*, I. Vindob. 1877.

ROBERT, who repeatedly but vainly attempted to establish the strict Rule of Benedict, along with twenty zealous adherents from what had hitherto been his monastery of **Molesme**, founded in 1098 a new monastery at **Cîteaux**, in the bishopric of Châlons, a few miles from Dijon, and which was taken under protection by Paschal II. (1100). The strict Rule of Benedict was however departed from by the admission of **lay-brothers** (*conversi*) for the administration of property. The greatest simplicity and decided subordination to the bishop were required. But it was through S. BERNARD that the

¹ *Vid.* Godfrey of Vendôme in Sirmondi *opera*, III. 549.

Cistercian congregation attained its great importance. He entered the order in 1113 along with the brothers, relations and friends he had won over. The great numbers who thronged in, however, immediately led to the founding of new monasteries, among them, in 1115 **Clairvaux** (Clara vallis), of which Bernard became the first Abbot. The first fundamental rule for the growing congregation, sketched by Stephen of Cîteaux, was confirmed by Calixtus II. in 1119, and again by Eugene III. in 1152. At that time the congregation already included 500 abbeys, but the resolution of the general chapter in 1151 to receive no new monasteries, remained without effect. A hundred years later the number had already become 1,800.

The new Congregation of Benedictines acquired an extraordinarily far-reaching influence, specially through Bernard's personal weight. By the strictness and poverty of their mode of life, which was also to show itself in the plainness of their buildings and churches, they at first offered a visible contrast to the **Cluniacs**, who had become powerful and rich and distinguished themselves by the splendour of their churches. The order was to approve its churchly sentiments by obedience and subjection to the diocesan bishops. The abbots render the oath to their bishop, the monasteries were not to mix themselves up with the pastoral duties of the priests and the rights of the clergy, were to allow no masses to be read for money, and were to govern no parish churches. The Abbot of Cîteaux, at the head of the whole Congregation, is limited in the government of the Order by the four abbots of highest rank after him and by the general chapter of the abbots and priors. Visitation of the monasteries was to take place yearly, that of Cîteaux by those four abbots. This institution, as on the one hand it had already a model in that of the Cluniacs, was again prescribed to other orders by Innocent III. In place of the black cowl of the Benedictines came the white one of the Cistercians.

It was Saint BERNARD¹ (born in 1091 at Fontaines, in Burgundy) to whose powerful personality, typical both for the monastic and the ecclesiastical spirit, that the Order owed the extraordinary speed and magnitude of its extension. The religious spirit of the time appears in him in its relatively purest form, both on its ascetic and on its ecclesiastical and hierarchical side. He is the pastor and leader of souls, driven by the spirit of heart-felt mystical piety and fulness of love, who, with all his extravagance, is not lacking in a certain moral sobriety; the self-denying ascetic monk, the striking popular preacher, whose word impresses the great of the earth as well as the people, who by his personal devotion kindled the enthusiasm of the Second Crusade; at the same time, he is the zealous Church-

¹ Opp. ed. MABILLON, 2 vols., 1867 (Ml. 182-185); A. NEANDER, *der hl. Bernh.* (1813) with Introd. and additions by DEUTSCH, 2 vols., Gotha 1889-90; REUTER in ZKG. I. 1; J. THIEL, *die politische Thätigkeit d. Abt B. v. Cl.* 1885.

man, who relentlessly champions the Church's authority and the subordination of the secular power to the spiritual; the adviser and instigator of a pope in the great political affairs of the Church. In the interest of the Church's authority in matters of faith, with all his personal humility he is at the same time the stern and even harsh persecutor of all free dialectical movements in ecclesiastical philosophy, the relentless enemy of Abelard and others whom he regards as menacing the stability of the Church's faith, the converter, but at the same time the persecutor of heresies, who in so doing by no means confines himself to spiritual weapons. He seeks to maintain simultaneously the two divergent ideals of the age, that of monastic renunciation of the world, and that of hierarchical dominion over the world (*vid. sup.* p. 268).

The powerfully aspiring Order of the Cistercians acquires great importance for the **spread** and establishment of **Christian civilization**, especially in the north-east of Germany among the Slavs. But with its great rise in prosperity it roused the jealousy of the Cluniacs, who, moreover, after the death of Pontius, received a worthy head in the above-mentioned Abbot Peter the Venerable. The reproaches which the Cistercians cast upon the older order also found an eloquent, if moderate expression in Bernard's *Apology ad Guilhelmum abbatem*.¹ In opposition to it, Peter Venerabilis, although holding Bernard in all honour and recognising the ascetic obligations of monasticism, represented milder and broader views, and in particular, in opposition to Bernard's rigorism, took the artistic splendour of the Cluniac churches under his protection.

Moreover, with its speedy growth and the ecclesiastical favour which it enjoyed in the richest measure, the Cistercian Order soon enough involuntarily turned likewise into the old grooves, acquired rich estates, villages, churches, mills, vassals, etc., as, indeed, it stood in need of such abundant resources for its civilizing mission. It received spiritual jurisdiction, at first over its own members, and then over the dependents of the monasteries, and so more and more laid itself open to secularising influences.

¹ Opp. ed. MABILLON, II. 824 (Ml. 182, 893). Cf. *Dialogus inter monachum Cluniacensem et Cisterciensem* in MARTÈNE ET DURAND, *Collectio amplissima*, V. 1575. GISEKE, *Ueb. d. Gegensatz der Cluniac. u. Cistercienser*, Mgd. 1886 (Gymn. Progr.).

6. **The Hospitallers.** *Sources:* **Crucifers:** BENED. LEONI, *l'origine e fundatione dell' ordine dei crociferi* 1598; **Hospitalarii S. Spiritus:** SAULNIER, *diss. de capite s. ordinis s. spiritus*, Lugd. 1694. **Antonites:** FALCONI, *Antoniane histor. compendium* (vid. UHLHORN, *Liebesthätigkeit im M.A.*, 478, Anm. 17).—*Literature:* UHLHORN, l.c. 99–101, 173 seq. and RE. 17, 300.

From antiquity the monasteries and canonical foundations had their hospitals and alms; by the great Orders of the Cluniacs and Cistercians this care of the poor and sick was practised to the greatest extent. But from the time of the Crusaders there also appear special brotherhoods solely for the purpose of providing for hospitals (*vid. Johannites inf.*), as in Italy the Order of the **Crucifers**, whose original hospital in Bologna Alexander III. took under protection in 1160, and Urban III. placed under the Holy See in 1185. In Southern France, GUIDO of Montpellier founded at that place about 1170–80 the Order of the **Hospitallers of the Holy Spirit**, which quickly spread and soon planted a firm foot in Rome, where Innocent III. favoured it and gave it a dominant centre in the ancient Anglo-Saxon refuge (*Schola Saxonica*), which was improved by additions into a large hospital.

Other hospital orders, especially that of the **Antonites**, showed the development of the custom of caring for the poor and sick in the existing monasteries into independent organizations. In relation to this the institution of **lay brothers** (*conversi*), which is seen everywhere in the monastic system of the age, became of importance, and afforded instruments suitable for such benevolent institutions branching off from the monastic administration proper. *Conversi* originally designated the monks in general, so far as they were not clerics (*vid. sup.*, Order of Grammont), but now designates those who, as a second class of monks, do indeed stand under the Rule, but, in accordance with the occupation with external affairs and services which has been assigned to them, enjoy a certain greater freedom. Such lay brotherhoods in the service of an hospital strove after greater independence of the monasteries, separated themselves from the latter and adopted a rule allowing freer movement, mostly the so-called Augustinian, and formed themselves into orders of their own, which themselves in turn formed parent establishments for a larger alliance. This, at least, was the method of procedure in the case of the so-called **Brothers of S. Antony**, an order which uncertain tradition attributes to the southern Frenchman GASTON at the end of the eleventh century.¹ As a matter of fact the Order originated in the hospital of

¹ ASB. Jan. ii., 160.

the Benedictine monastery of St. Petri montis majoris at Mota (St. Didier de la Motte) in the diocese of Vienne. Towards the end of the eleventh century the monastery obtained possession of the relics of S. ANTONY, the patron against all sorts of sickness in man and beast, from whom at that time healing was specially sought for the so-called S. Antony's fire, a gangrenous disease of the limbs. Thereby the hospital of the monastery, which was under a "Magister" and his lay brotherhood, acquired great fame. It began with great success to collect for its purposes in all parts of Christendom. Although as early as 1194 it acquired a house in Rome, and soon afterwards one also in the East, and instituted preceptorates abroad, Innocent III. still reckoned it among the appurtenances of the monastery. But monasteries and the Hospital Brotherhood quarrelled over the large revenues of the collections, and the brethren strove for emancipation, and finally, in a very violent manner, gained complete independence, and at the same time possession of the relics of S. Antony. Subsequently the order adopted the Rule of S. Augustine (1280), which was confirmed by Boniface VIII. in 1297, while he at the same time granted exemption to the Order and placed it immediately under the Pope. The Hospital Brothers thus became rich and luxurious regular canons of S. Augustine (Canons of S. Antony, *Tönniesherren*).

7. **The Knightly Orders.** *Literature:* BIEDENFELD, *Gesch. aller geistl. und weltl. Ritterorden*, 2 vols., Weimar 1841; H. PRUTZ, *Kulturgesch. der Kreuzzüge*, 1883, Bk. III. 4.

(a) **Knights of S. John.** *Sources:* CODICE DIPLOM. del sacro ordine Gerosolymitano, Lucca 1733; PAOLI, *dissertatione dell' origine ed istitudo del sacro militar ordine di S. Giovanbattista*, Rom. 1781; STATUTA ET CONSUETUDINES s. domus Hospitalis S. Joannis Baptistæ after the Maltese archives in PRUTZ, *Kulturgesch. der Kreuzz.*, appendix 601 sqq.—*Literature:* *L'histoire des chevaliers hosp. de s. Jean de Jérus.*, p. l'abbé VERTOT, 2nd ed., Par. 1761, 7 vols. N. (Niethammer), *G. d. Malteserordens nach Vertot*, 1792, 2 vols.; H. VON ORTENBERG, *der Ritterorden des h. Joh. v. Jerus.*, Rgsb. 1866; UHLHORN, *die Anfänge etc.* in ZKG. VI. 46–62, and id., *die christl. Liebesthätigkeit im MA.*, 1884, pp. 107–110, 161 sqq.

Out of the same needs and impulses of the time as those Hospital Brotherhoods, and brought to a head by the movements of the Crusades, there also arose the **Spiritual Knightly Orders**, especially the **Order of S. John**, the **first great Hospital Order**, which became of great influence on the development of those above mentioned, especially of the Order of the Holy Spirit.

Hospices for poor and sick pilgrims in the Holy Land had already long become a necessity. The monastery of St. Maria de Latina was probably founded by Normans as early as the end of the tenth century. Then Maurus, a rich native of Amalfi, founded about 1065–70 the **Hospitale Hierosolymitanum**, which was placed under a Master and a lay brotherhood.

When the crusaders conquered Jerusalem in 1099, Master Gerhard (Tonge?) presided over the Hospital, which was now confirmed in its possessions by Pope Paschal II. in 1113 as **Hospitale S. Joannis Baptistæ**. Even now the Hospital acquired affiliated branches in the West (S. Giles in Arles) and settlements in various Italian coast cities. Knights from among the crusaders devoted themselves to the service of the Hospital, and Gerhard's successor, **RAYMOND DE PUIS** (de Podio), gave the Hospitallers a Rule (1121), according to which they were obliged to take the traditional monastic vows. The **care of the pilgrims** remained as a matter of fact the duty of the Order, performed with great devotion. Armed service in protecting and convoying the pilgrims, and care for the provision of safe roads, were naturally involved in their duty. But in the Rule, Raymond as yet makes no reference to this; among the members of the Order the only distinction is that between clergy and laity; the confirming Bull of Innocent II. in 1130 mentions, alongside of the *fratres* who escort the pilgrims, *servientes* and horsemen in the pay of the Order. Through the resources which streamed in upon it, its great acquisitions in the East and foundations in the Christian West, the Order assumed a magnificent development, but gradually suffered transformation by the rise of the distinction between **knights and menial brothers**. The knights received a garb of their own (they wore the black mantle with the eight-pointed white cross), and higher rank and privileges, and were released from the personal duty of the care of the poor. The **military and political factor** obtained the preponderance. Frederick I. already freed the Knights of S. John from all taxes, tolls and liabilities to service, and according to the Bull of confirmation of Anastasius IV.¹ they were allowed to establish churches, oratories, and churchyards everywhere. Their own priests and clergy were only to be subject to the Order itself and the Pope. No bishop might impose interdict, suspension or excommunication on their churches; the members of the Order remained free from the consequences of an interdict issued against their place of residence. They are privileged with entire freedom from ecclesiastical tithes.

From the time of the conquest of Jerusalem by Saladin (1187) their widespread possessions in the East and the West with their immense and carefully administered revenues, enabled them to develop a formal state belonging to the Order, and to conduct the war with the unbelievers for a hundred years more from **Ptolemais** (Acre), which was now their centre, and from the mountain fortress of Margat, which was regarded as impregnable, till after the fall

¹ 21st October, 1154, JAFFÉ 9930.

of Margat (1285) and the severe defeat at the defence of Tripolis (1289), they settled in **Cyprus** and then in **Rhodes**, and even then formed a bulwark against Islam, which menaced the West. Driven out of Rhodes by Suleiman II. (1522), they found their resting-place in Malta, even now bound to protect Christendom against Turks and pirates.

- (b) **The Templars.** Sources: BERNARDI *tractatus de nova militia s. exhortatio ad milites templi*, opp. Mab. IV. 98 (Ml. 182, 921). *Regula pauperum commilitonum Christi* in MIRÆUS, *chron. Cisterciense*, Col. 1614, p. 43 (also HOLSTEN-BROCKIE, II. 422 and MANSI, XXI. 359); **Règles et statuts secrets des Templiers** publ. par C. H. MAILLARD DE CHAMBEÛRE, Par. 1840 (collection of statutes arising 1247–1266); **Règle du Temple publiée pour la société de l'histoire de France**, p. Henri de CURZON, Par. 1886.—Literature: DUPUY, *Hist. des Templiers*, Par. 1650 and Bruxelles 1751; *Hist. crit. et apol. des chevaliers du Temple de Jér.* p. feu le R. P. M. J., Par. 1789; in extracts from which: *the Knights of the Temple at Jer.*, Lyon 1790, 2 vols.; F. WILCKE, *Gesch. d. Tempelh. O.*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. 1860; H. PRUTZ, *Entw. und Untergang d. T. O.*, Brl. 1880; H. REUTER, *Alexander III.*, 3 vols. 594, sqq.

Before the Johannites had developed into an order of knights under obligation to combat the unbelievers, a number of knights under HUGO DE PAYNS (de Paganis, from Payns in Champagne, not far from Troyes) had bound themselves in 1119 to protect and escort the pilgrims, and some years later had rendered their vow into the hands of the Patriarch of Jerusalem. King BALDWIN II. gave them lodging in his palace to the east of the Temple and in neighbouring buildings: **Pauperes commilitones Christi templique Salomonis (Templars)**. With their knightly vow they combined the usual monastic vow (poverty, obedience and chastity). They at first lived very scantily, on the support of Baldwin, but soon enjoyed the favour of S. BERNARD. The Council of **Troyes** in 1128, held by a papal legate and attended by Hugo himself, exhorted to entrance into the new Order, and sketched statutes for it. Hugo had great success in his tour round the courts in France, England, and even in Germany, where Lothar II. presented a part of the county of Supplinburg to the Order. Three hundred knights of the noblest families and great possessions were added to the Order. Moreover, even violent knights, who happened to be under ecclesiastical excommunication, found admission after rendering penance, as also ALEXANDER III. allowed the Templars of Aragon to admit, after penance, the notorious Brabanters, Aragonese and Basques, from among whom the wild mercenary bands of the time were accustomed to recruit, and who were regarded as standing outside the communion of the Church on account of their atrocities.¹ The actual

¹ PRUTZ, *Entw.*, p. 281. Cf. on the admission of elements of this very sort BERNARD, l.c., cp. 5. The oldest *Regula pauperum* preserved contains in its

development of the Order speedily passed the lines of the original rule of a one-sided monastic character, which, moreover, had itself reserved the right of further changes to the Masters of the Order. At their general chapters there arose special statutes, corresponding to the many-sided activity of the knights, and which were imparted to the individual knights only as necessity arose. The nucleus of the Order was formed by the **knights**, men of noble descent through pure wedlock and of unimpeachable standing. They wore the white mantle with the eight-pointed red cross. At first it seems that knights, squires, and common soldiers were engaged as mercenaries for a stated time, who were not themselves members of the Order. Subsequently, for this purpose and for the always increasing administration of property, **serving brothers** (*fratres servientes*) were taken into the Order itself, men of civic rank, partly as **companions in arms** (*armigeri*), who formed separate troops in war, partly as **crafts-brothers** (*famuli*). Finally there also appear **clerics of the order** (*capellani*),¹ who may be ordained by any bishop in ecclesiastical communion with Rome. The Templars began from 1172 to withdraw from the spiritual jurisdiction of the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem, and likewise from the regular spiritual authorities in their great Western possessions. Their clergy were directly subordinated to the Pope, but in spite of their highly esteemed position remained very much in the hands of the Order. Nevertheless, they were never able to satisfy the entire spiritual needs of the widely ramified Order; hence the Templars to a large extent availed themselves of the services of other clergy, with the approbation of their superiors.

At the head of the whole Order stood the Master of the principal house at Jerusalem as **Grand Master**, with the rank of a prince. Alongside of him was the General Chapter; next to the Grand Master was the Seneschal as his appointed representative.² The great wealth and landed property of the Order in the different countries of Christendom made numerous officials necessary, and thus, in the Order, a great social corporation, closely interconnected and well articulated, spread over Christendom. By the popes of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries it was favoured with privileges and ad-

present form later elements also, but nevertheless goes back to the original Rule of Troyes.

¹ The Bull of Alexander III., "*Omne datum optimum*," in JAFFÉ, 10897, of the 18th June, 1163. Cf. 11013 (of 30th March, 1164, also cited elsewhere as of Sept., 1162).

² On the further hierarchy of officers of the Order, *vid.* PRUTZ, l.c., p. 43 sqq.

vantages of all sorts, which were jealously regarded by the clergy, and often rightly so, as injurious to the regular episcopal government of the Church,¹ and it was exempted from ecclesiastical jurisdiction and placed immediately under the Papal See. The Pope is the bishop of the Templars; even the people on the properties of the Templars are exempted from the episcopal jurisdiction. The chaplains of the Order received extensive faculties in regard to cases otherwise reserved. The Order was protected against the issue of ban and interdict, and was empowered to build churches and lay out churchyards everywhere.

In the too powerful Order the ideal impulses early began to be overgrown by worldly and self-seeking interests. As an independent corporation with boundless resources it ceased to subordinate itself as a means to the general end, and made itself and its own worldly advantage its aim. Relentless prosecution of its secular objects, in individual cases even to the extent of the open betrayal of Christian interests, moral excesses and the worst passions began to gain power.

Between the Johannites and the Templars great jealousy arose, which at times even went the length of open conflict. As early as 1208 Innocent III. complained against the **Templars**, that to them religion was only a screen that they might gain the world. Against the **Johannites**, who supported the Greek Emperor Vatazes against the Latin Empire, Gregory IX. directed the strongest reproaches in regard to their entire moral conduct.

(c) **The Order of the Teutonic Knights or Brothers of the German House of our Lady at Jerusalem.** *Sources:* JACOBUS A VITRIACO, I. 66 (in BONGARS, *Gesta dei p. Franc.*, I. 1085. *De primordiis ordinis Teuton. narr.*, ed. TÖPPEN in *Ser. r. Pruss.*, I. 220; the *Statutes* of the Teutonic Order edited by HENNIG, 1806; HENNES, *Codex diplom. Ordinis St. Mariæ Teuton. (Urkundenbuch d. D.O.)*, 2 vols., Mainz 1845 and 1861; STREHLKE, *Tabulæ ordinis Teuton.*, Brl. 1869 (wherein p. 239 sqq. the *privilegia generalia* of the emperors, and p. 263 sqq. those of the popes); SCHÖNHUTH, *d. Ordensbuch d. Br. vom D. Hause*, Heilbronn 1842.—*Literature:* J. VOIGT, *Gesch. d. dtsch. Ritterordens*, 2 vols., 1857–59; PRUTZ, *Kulturgesch.* (vid. p. 354), p. 235 sqq.

A German hospital for the reception and care of German pilgrims had already arisen at Jerusalem under King Baldwin.

CELESTINE II. (1143–44) placed it under the Grand Master of the Johannites. The Emperor Frederick I. appears to have shown it great favour. After the catastrophe of 1187 the remaining mem-

¹ Alexander III. in the Bull of exemption of 1164, already mentioned, confirmed essentially the same privileges which had already been conferred on the Johannites by Anastasius IV. in 1154.

bers of the society took up their work in **Acre** among the German pilgrims gathered there for the so-called Third Crusade, and supported the citizens of **Bremen** and **Lübeck**, who had come with Count Adolphus of Holstein, in their exertions to remedy the miserable condition of the German pilgrims who had fallen sick. Duke **FREDERICK OF SWABIA** in particular took up this German hospital, and procured for it confirmation and a letter of protection from Pope Clement III.¹ After his death, the German princes who came in 1197 under Conrad of Mayence promoted the expansion of the hospital society into an **Order of Knights**, which was to combine the duties of the Hospitallers of S. John and of the Templars: "that they should vow to serve the sick and protect the Holy Land." **INNOCENT III.** gave it confirmation on the 19th February, 1199.²

Only Germans of free and noble birth were admitted as knights; alongside of them stand the brothers, whose duty it is to care for the sick in the hospitals. From the time of **HONORIUS III.** they might also admit half-brothers for the support of the aims prosecuted by the knights. The priests taken into service for the sake of spiritual functions now also find admission into the Order itself as actual priest-brothers.

The newly arisen Order, whose at first modest resources speedily increased through rich gifts, had at first to suffer from the jealousy of the two older knightly Orders. But under **HERMANN OF SALZA**, the highly gifted Master of the Order (from 1210), it quickly rose in prosperity, and **HONORIUS III.** bestowed upon it all the rights and privileges conferred on the two older Orders. But an entirely new service was opened to the Order by the enterprise in **Prussia** (*vid. inf.*), where also the Order of the **Brothers of the Sword**, founded in 1202, united with it in 1227.

(d) **The Spanish Knightly Orders.** In Spain also the conflict with the infidels led to similar organizations. Here (1) the **Order of Calatrava** arose in attachment to the Order of the **Cistercians** and under its guidance as *militia sacra ordinis Cisterciensis*. When King Sancho IX. of Castile presented the town of Calatrava, which was threatened by the Moors, to the Cistercian Order, Abbot Raymond founded the knightly Order in 1158 to defend it. (2) **The Ordo S. Juliani de Pereyro.** The Order, founded in 1152 by two knights, then confirmed by King Ferdinand of Léon and the Pope in 1177, on acquiring possession of the fortress of **Alcantara** (1218) named itself after it. While these two Orders assumed the full monastic vows (it was not till the sixteenth century that they were allowed to marry), the **milites Eboræ** (from the town of Evera

¹ 6th Feb., 1191; **JAFFÉ**, 16667.

² In what sense the Teutonic Order is to be regarded, as a continuation of the old brothers of the Hospital of S. Mary in Jerusalem, or as a new creation, *vid.* **PRUTZ**, l.c., 235 sqq. and 548 sq.; **UHLHORN**, l.c., 165 sq.

in Portugal) bound themselves from 1162 onwards only to war against the infidels, to works of mercy, to fidelity and chastity in wedlock, and to reverent obedience to the Cistercian Order, to which they were affiliated, after the fashion of the so-called *conversi* or Tertiaries (*vid. inf.*) which were already to be found in various Orders. The Order of **St. Iago di Compostella** (*militia St. Jacobi*), which arose independently of the Cistercians, and which was intended for the protection of pilgrims and recognised by Alexander III. and Innocent III., might also have married members.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

The Spread of Christianity in the North and East.

1. The Christianizing of the Slavs.

Sources: (1) HELMOLDI *Chron. Slavorum*, with the continuation by ARNOLD MGS. XXI., 1 sqq. and ed. PERTZ, Hann. 1868, in German by LAURENT, GDV., vol. 7 (for criticism *vid.* VOELKEL, SHIRREN, USINGER and others in Wttb., II., 305); *Versus antiq. de vita* VICELIN. ed. N. BEECK, 1877. SAXO GRAMM., *Gesta Dan.* ed. A. HOLDER, Strassb. 1866. (2) The three *vita*e of OTTO of Bamb.: *a) v. Prieflingensis* MGS. XII. and *b) and c) EBONIS v. Ottonis* and HERBORDI *dialogus*, JAFFÉ, BrG. V. (Mon. Bamb.) 1869; G. HAAG, *Quellen z. Gesch. des Pommernap. O. v. B.*, Stettin 1874 (Festschrift). Cf. FDG. 16, 297; 18, 241.—*Literature*: L. v. GIESEBRECHT, *vid.* p. 148; W. v. GIESEBRECHT, *Kaiserg.* III., 2; IV., 1; W. BERNHARDI *Lothar v. Supplinburg*, Lpz. 1874; F. WINTER, p. 317 and 350; W. WIESENER, *Gesch. d. chr. K. Pommerns zur Wendenzeit*, Brl. 1889.

1. At the beginning of this period, in the North, Archbishop Adalbert of Bremen (from 1043) entertained extensive plans of a northern patriarchate. His influence on Svend Estridson of Denmark brought about the addition of new Danish bishoprics to the already founded bishoprics of Sleswick, Ripen and Seeland (Roeskilde). Adalbert consecrated an Icelandic bishop, and the Orkneys came into his diocese. Under the West Gothlandic race which succeeded the ancient Upsala kings the relations to **Sweden** were renewed, similarly **Norway** was attracted. But after the fall of the ambitious prelate the way was prepared for the definitive emancipation of the Scandinavian churches from Bremen-Hamburg, and at the same time there ensued with the assassination of Gottschalk the ruler of the Obotrites (1066), the restoration of heathenism in the great, but now decaying empire of the Wends. Mecklenburg, Oldenburg, and Ratzeburg were destroyed, Hamburg levelled with the ground, and the diocese of Hamburg north of the Elbe entirely occupied by the heathen Wends. Adalbert's successor, LIEMAR, called himself Bishop of Bremen only. In the great German ecclesiastical controversy he stood on the side of Henry IV. against Gregory and his successor, and adhered to the schism. This favoured the ecclesiastical separation of the North, where King ERIC of Denmark now took the part of Urban II., and, with the co-operation of ANSELM of Canterbury, the zealous Gregorian ASGER of Lund was raised to the archbishopric of the North.

But a new rise in prosperity began in the beginning of the twelfth century. After the fall of the Wendish prince Kruto (Kruko), GOTTSCHALK's son HENRY renewed his father's rule in attachment to German civilization; in Holstein the first Schauenburg, COUNT ADOLPHUS, ruled (from 1110), in Sleswick KNUD LAWARD as commander of the Danes, attaching himself to German customs, was in close connection with the Emperor Lothar, and after Henry's death (1121) became at the same time king of the Obotrites and the Wends.

2. The work of VICELIN takes place under these circumstances. Born in Hameln and educated in Paderborn, he was sent by Bishop Adalbert II. of Bremen to the Wendish prince Henry, in whose domains Alt-Lübeck was the sole remaining Christian centre. But after Henry's death had rendered further undertakings vain, Vicelin was called from Meldorf, through emissaries of the Holstein district of Faldera, to the then Slav frontier, and in 1128 founded in Wipendorf the monastery of regular canons of S. Augustine, **Novum Monasterium** (Neumünster). The favourable prospects opened by Knud's rule over the Wend country were destroyed by his assassination in 1131. The Obotrite prince Niklot († 1161) held fast by heathenism. But the interference of the Emperor Lothar, his erection of Sigeburg on the Segeberg chalk mountain, gave Vicelin a new point of support.

But the introduction of order and Christianity was still prevented by the war which Henry the Proud of Bavaria (Lothar's son-in-law) carried on with Albert the Bear, on whom the Hohenstaufen Conrad III. had bestowed the Duchy of Saxony. Meanwhile the Slavs devastated the Christian foundations (Lübeck and Segeberg), till Count Henry of Badewide, with the help of Holsten, inflicted several serious defeats on the Slavs. After Albert had given up his claims on Saxony, and after Count Adolf of Holstein had received Wagria, and Henry, as first Count of Ratzeburg, had received the Polabing country, it was possible to think of colonization and Christian foundations. For this was the question much more than the conversion of the Wends, seeing that the remaining Wends were more and more absorbed by the German colonists. Still another storm arose through Niklot's invasion of Wagria, whereby in 1147 he desired to anticipate the crusade against the Slavs. For the crusading movement which was kindled by Bernard's preaching was rather diverted by Saxon rulers to the securing of German dominion and civilization in the Wend country. While the chief enterprise was directed against the Liutizes, the young Henry the Lion, the son of Henry the Proud, in his war against Niklot, which was supported by the Danes, at least obtained from the Obotrites the promise to give up heathenism and establish a relationship of friendly alliance between Niklot and the German power.

Taking advantage of the favourable circumstances Vicelin was consecrated by Bishop Hartwich of Bremen in 1149 as Bishop of Oldenburg (Holstein), but, in order to obtain possession of at least a part of the revenues assigned to him, was obliged to accept investiture from Henry the Lion, who here appeared as an independent sovereign. Vicelin died in 1154.

3. During the same time ALBERT THE BEAR, the son of Count Otto of Ascania or Ballenstädt and Margrave of North Saxony (Altmark), carried on his war against the Liutizes and Wilzes, conquered Priegnitz, and on the other side the district of Zerbst and Wittenberg, and by treaty with the friendly prince Pribislav in

Brandenburg put himself in possession of the Havel country. The bishoprics of Havelberg and Brandenburg, formerly erected by Otto I., could now be revived, and the spread of the German rule beyond the Elbe, in which German colonists and also **Johannites** and **Templars** were brought in to assist, went hand in hand with the erection of ecclesiastical foundations, in forming which Albert specially availed himself of the **Premonstratensians** in Magdeburg. Havelberg received an influential bishop in Anselm, who belonged to this Order. The principal monastery at St. Mary's in Magdeburg founded the convent at Leitzkau which was of great importance for the Christianising of the Wends, where the hitherto Provost Wigger, who was elevated to the Bishopric of Brandenburg in 1138, was also accustomed to reside as bishop. From 1144 Albert called himself Margrave of Brandenburg.

4. Many missionary attempts had already been made in Eastern Pomerania, which in 997 had fallen into dependence on Poland. But the renewed subjection of the country by Boleslav III. (1121) was decisive, in consequence of which **Western Pomerania** (Duke Wratislav) was also obliged to acknowledge the Polish supremacy and to promise to accept Christianity. Here began the work of Otto of Bamberg, the apostle of the Pomeranians. This southern German had previously worked at the court of Duke Wladislav Hermann and brought about his second marriage with the sister of Henry IV., and had afterwards become Henry IV.'s chancellor, and in 1102 Bishop of Bamberg.¹ Called by Boleslav, the son of his former patron, Otto came in 1124 with a brilliant train through Poland to Pomerania, was well received in Kammin by Wratislav and his already Christian wife Heila, and afterwards laid the first foundations of Christianity in the rich commercial town of Julin on Wollin, and then also in Stettin, in doing which it was of advantage to him that he was skilful enough to obtain milder conditions of peace from the Polish duke. For a second time, in 1128, he came by Magdeburg and Havelberg to the western part of the country, to Demmin. His imposing and at the same time gentle nature had a winning effect, and at the Diet at Usedom gained the good will of the magnates of the country. Yet great conflicts between Christianity and heathenism ensued. But the bishopric of Julin appears to be firmly established in 1140. It was subsequently transferred to Kolberg, though the Polish archbishopric of Gnesen raised claims to it.

¹ He became the founder of the Abbey of Michelsberg, and the restorer of the ruined cathedral of Bamberg.

When the chief power of the Slavonic crusade in 1147 penetrated into Pomerania also and threatened Stettin, the cross of the Pomeranian warriors and the exertions of the bishop prevented a hostile collision. Duke Ratibor, already baptized by Otto, entered into negotiations with the Saxon crusaders, and thenceforth promoted Christian foundations.

5. The missionary and civilizing work of the Cistercians, which was so highly important for the whole Wend country, now soon began. Henry the Lion, who by his relentless procedure in several ways thwarted the rights and claims of the Archbishop of Bremen, gained a powerful instrument for missionary work in the Cistercian monk BERNO, whom Pope Hadrian IV. himself caused to be consecrated Bishop of Mecklenburg. In 1158 he transferred his seat farther south to Schwerin, about the same time when for like reasons of security the bishopric of Oldenburg was transferred to Lübeck. Berno extended his activity as far as Demmin, towards the end of the seventh decade baptized Pribislaw, the son of the Wend prince Niklot, and included Pomerania as far as the mouth of the Peene in his diocese (1167). He must be designated the apostle of the Obotrites, as Vicelin is that of the Wagrians.

The powerful rise in influence of the Cistercians in the Wend country began from the time when the tension between the Emperor Frederick I. and the Order which took the part of Alexander III. slackened, till the final reconciliation of the Pope and the Emperor removed the last obstacles. From that time numerous new Cistercian abbeys arose in the Wend country in contradiction of the decision of the General Chapter of Citeaux in 1151 (*vid. sup.* p. 351). The new Christian problem of civilization altered the principles held at first. The monasteries became the fiscal and judicial superiors of numerous villages, and were obliged to undertake spiritual functions and organize a Christian parochial system. As in general in the effort to gain the Wend country on the Baltic, the Danish influence concurred with the Saxon, Cistercian foundations, such as Dargun, and afterwards Eldena and Kolbaz in Pomerania, proceeded from Denmark, favoured by Archbishop Eskil of Lund. Rügen came into the hands of Waldemar II. of Denmark. The Cistercian foundation of Oliwa near Danzig was established by Colbaz in Eastern Pomerania through alliance with the Prince of Pomerellen. But the Cistercians obtained a firm footing also in Wagria and in the middle Wend country, the domain of Albert the Bear and the archiepiscopal see of Magdeburg, as likewise in the southern Wend country (Meissen and Lusatia). To this there was finally added their action in Silesia and Poland.

2. The Baltic Provinces.

Sources: ARNOLDI *Lubecensis chronicon Slavorum*, MGS. XXI.; HEINRICI *chronicon Livoniæ*, *ibid.* XXIII.—Literature: DEHIO, *vid. sup.* p. 136; K. v. SCHLÖZER, *Livland und die Anfänge deutschen Lebens im Norden*, Brl. 1850.

The earlier trading enterprises of the Danes and Swedes in Cour-

land and Esthonia were followed by those of **Bremen** and **Lübeck**, which from the middle of the twelfth century led to more permanent Christian influences. The Augustinian canon **MEINHARD** of Segeberg attached himself to traders who during summer opened their booths on the *Düna*. The Russian Grand Prince Vladimir of Polozk allowed him to preach. As early as 1184 the first church arose near **Uexküll** on the *Düna* (on the frontier of Livonia towards Semgallen and Courland). Some little success encouraged in 1186 the erection of the **Livonian Bishopric**, which was constituted from Bremen. After Meinhard's death in 1196 the Livonians, now become Christian, begged for a new bishop from Bremen. The Cistercian **BERTHOLD** of Loccum was sent as Meinhard's successor, but was shortly expelled by the people, who had become mistrustful. He now organized a crusade in Westphalia and Lower Saxony, in which many prelates and knights and traders also took part. They defeated the Livonians, but the latter slew Berthold in 1198. The Bremen canon, **ALBERT** (of Stade, not of Apeldern or Buxhöwden), methodically prosecuted this warlike mission. In indefatigable journeys to Germany, with the support of the Pope as well as of the Danish Cnut and the German Philip, he collected ever new hosts of pilgrims. In 1201 he founded the German trading city of **Riga**, and in the **Order of the Sword** (Brotherhood of the knightly service of Christ, *vid.* p. 359) which he founded, he provided himself with a weapon, which was to be entirely subject to the control of the bishop. His aim was the establishment of a single combined spiritual and secular power. Alongside of him stood the Cistercian **DIETRICH** (of Thoreida), who under Meinhard had already worked for the Livonian mission with Pope Innocent, and whom Albert now (1205) made abbot of the first Livonian (Cistercian) monastery of **Dünamünde**. The Livonians were baptized in a body, and in the year 1207, at the Diet of the court at Sinzig, Albert accepted Livonia as a fief from King Philip.

Controversies with the Order of the Sword, which strove for independence, were several times sought to be adjusted by Pope Innocent. The bishopric of Riga was freed from its subordination to the metropolitan see of Bremen, and Albert was granted full powers to consecrate other bishops also. When the Order sought to establish itself independently in **Esthonia**, Albert consecrated Abbot **DIETRICH** as **Bishop** for the latter, but thereby fell into conflict with the Order. Innocent indeed confirmed Dietrich, but at the same time commissioned the **archbishopric of Lund** with the ecclesiastical supervision and thereby promoted the intentions of King Waldemar II. with Esthonia, to whom Albert had to give way. Bishop **DIETRICH** fell near **Reval** in the war of the Danes against the Esthonians. But after the most successful rising of the Esthonians against the Danes, which compelled the latter to surrender Esthonia,

renewed German trains of pilgrims worked in favour of their subjection; **Dorpat** fell into Albert's hands, and the resistance to him of the Order of the Sword ceased. Albert (until his death, which ensued in 1229) was able to organize the whole province ecclesiastically, but did not obtain from the Pope the elevation to the rank of an archbishop which he desired.

The hard pressed Order of the Sword under VOLQUIN sought attachment to the Teutonic Order which had meantime penetrated into **Prussia**, and was united to it in 1237, after a severe defeat of the Germans by the Lithuanians. Riga was now elevated by Pope Alexander IV. in 1255 into the metropolis of the **Livonian and Prussian Church**. From **Livonia**, **Semgallen** had already been subjected in 1218. Finally the **Curians** also, in order to save their independence, had consented to receive Christianity. This had been attained, after Albert's death, by means of a treaty, by the Cistercian BALDWIN, who was entrusted by the Pope with the arrangement of affairs. But this method of procedure, whereby their freedom and nationality were to be secured to the Curians, was not according to the taste of the time. The town of Riga itself seems to have taken part in the intrigues against it. The new bishop, Nicholas, a Premonstratensian, returned to the old way, Christianising and Germanising by violence. Baldwin was indeed made Bishop of Semgallen by the Pope, and equipped with extraordinary authority, but the conflict between him and the Bishop of Riga led finally to the removal of Baldwin, in whose place William of Modena administered as papal legate. The controversy as to the rights of the Brothers of the Sword, the Bishop of Riga and the town of Riga, continued.

3. Prussia.

Sources : PETRI de Dusburg *chronicon Prussie* in *Script. rer. Prussic.*, I, ed. TOEPPEN; HARTKNOCH's 14 *Dissertationes* in the appendix to his edition of Peter of Dusburg, Jena 1679; VOIGT, *Geschichte Preussens*, vols. 1-3, Königsberg 1827 sqq.; A. L. EWALD, *die Eroberung Preussens durch die Deutschen*, 4 vols., Halle 1872-85; WINTER, *Cisterzienser*, I, p. 360 sqq.

In order to set free a few Polish Cistercians who had fallen into the hands of the heathen Prussians, GOTTFRIED of Lekno (Lukina in Poland), a German by birth, went to Prussia, found a friendly reception, and begged for and, after his return, received from Innocent III. the authority to preach in Prussia (POTTHAST, No. 2901). In 1207 he crossed the Weichsel in the company of the monk PHILIP; at the same time he gained the co-operation of the Cistercian monk CHRISTIAN of Oliva, and Innocent III. commanded the Archbishop of **Gnesen** to provide for the Prussian mission. The not unfavourable result of their action was partly hindered by the fact that the Cistercian abbots took offence at the life of the missionary monks, which was necessarily less restricted and contrary to the Rule, but partly and still more by the fact that the Pomeranian and Polish princes were only too much inclined to regard and utilize the new converts as their subjects. Nevertheless Christian was able to present to the Pope in Rome as firstfruits, two Prussian petty chiefs, who had presented lands to the mission, and who were solemnly baptized in Rome itself. Christian himself was consecrated Bishop of Prussia. But the success, which had hitherto been peaceful,

though not extending to great masses, now awakened resistance. After Philip and other Christians had been killed by the Prussians in 1214 or 1215, the new bishop himself now adopted violent means, levied crusading hosts and leaned on the support of the greedy Duke Conrad of Masovia. Pope Honorius III. agreed that the Crusaders intended for the Holy Land might also be turned against the heathen Prussians. Dantzic, Oliva and all the monasteries founded by Christian fell victims to the vigorous resistance of the Prussians, and Christian was only able to maintain his position in the strong **Kulm**. Although he had made attempts at a real Christian mission by the education of native Christian teachers, etc., Christian still appeared as the political opponent of the people and the friend of their enemy, the Duke of Masovia. After the Order of the **Knightly Brothers of Dobrin**, founded by Christian, had been worn out in a few years, CONRAD of Masovia, in agreement with Christian, called in the assistance of the **Teutonic Order** (under HERMANN of Salza), on whom a part of the Kulm land was bestowed. A smaller number of Brothers of the Order was followed by a greater in 1230 under HERMANN of Balk. The Teutonic Knights, when they had obtained firm footing at a few points, now conquered the country in a fifty years' war with the frequent assistance of German Crusaders, and broke the terrible defence of the Prussians.

Hand in hand with the war went the favouring of German colonists, especially of those from the Lower Rhine, and the founding of towns which received partly Lübeck and partly Magdeburg law, as well as the formation of peasantries with free communal administration. Königsberg was founded in 1256 in memory of King Ottocar of Bohemia and his merits in the subjection of Samland; Marienburg, built in 1276, became the chief residence of the Master of the Teutonic Order in the fourteenth century. What remained of the Prussians after the fearful war, were finally obliged after very obstinate resistance to consent to receive Christianity. In these conflicts, ecclesiastical activity such as Christian and after him the Papal legate, William of Modena, sought to maintain, and men like the Dominican Hyacinth sought to exercise, fell greatly into the background. The foundations of ecclesiastical organization were laid under Innocent IV. in 1243 by WILLIAM of Modena in the erection of the four bishoprics of **Kulm**, **Pomerania**, **Ermland**, and **Samland**, which soon afterwards were placed under the Livonian bishopric of **Riga** as metropolitan. The Order successfully resisted the intention of the Pope to give the bishops a portion of the country conquered by the Order, as a free bishopric; only Ermland was able to withdraw itself from the claims of the Order, as afterwards from the metropolitan alliance with Riga by placing itself immediately under the Pope. The Order, which was purely guided by interests of power, produced energetic personalities, and solved a great problem of civilization, but ruled tyrannically and soon fell away into secularization. It was in constant dissension with the clergy; the wars with Poland finally led to the result, that in 1466 (Battle of Tannenberg) it lost West Prussia to Poland, and was obliged to receive East Prussia as a fief of the Crown of Poland.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

The History of the Ecclesiastical Sciences till the end of the Twelfth Century.

Literature: The Histories of Philosophy by H. RITTER, ERDMANN, UEBERWEG (2nd Part, 7th ed. by HEINZE, 1883), A. STÖCKEL (1865) and B. HAURÉAU, *La philos. scolast.*, 2 vols., 2nd ed., Paris 1873; C. PRANTL, *G. der Logik im Abendlande*, 4 vols., 1855 sqq.; H. v. EICKEN, *Gesch. u. System der mittelalt. Weltanschauung*, 1887.

Introductory note.

THE scholastic dialectic had hitherto been treated as a philosophic study on the basis of the expedients handed down from antiquity without reference to theological problems. About the middle of the twelfth century the circle of view was expanded by the making known of the whole Logic (the *ᾠργانون*) of Aristotle. Others of his chief writings also were soon made known, at first through the medium of Arabian Aristotelians, and afterwards, towards the end of the period, from the original Greek text.

But with the rise in the prosperity of the Church since the middle of the eleventh century, the attempt to draw the dialectical discussions into the service of the dogmas of the Church had begun to be made. Only, the scholastic science of dialectics, as Peter Damiani required, was not to transgress the attitude of a handmaid of theology. But it was soon seen that this limitation could not be maintained.

1. Berengar and Lanfranc.

Sources: LANFRANCI *opp.* ed. GILES, Lond. 1844 (ML 150); BERENGARII *de sacra cena* (discovered by Lessing at Wolfenbüttel) ed. STÄUDLIN (*Tübing. Progr.* 1820 sqq.), afterwards A.T. and F. Th. VISCHER, Berl. 1835; *The Acts of the Synod of Rome* in MANSI, XIX.; H. SUDENDORF, *B. Tur., Samml. ihm betreffender Briefe*, Hamb. 1850.—*Literature*: *Histoire litt. de la France*, VIII. 260; HASSE, *Anselm v. C.*, I., 21 sqq.; LESSING, *B.T.* in the *Works* VIII. of Lachmann's edition; J. SCHNITZER, *B. v. T., sein Leben, etc.*, München 1890; H. HALFMANN, *Cardinal Humbert*, Gttg. 1882.

BERENGAR, scholasticus in Tours, from 1040 deacon in Angers (ob. 1088), turned against the view of the Lord's Supper at one time championed by Paschasius (p. 201), and since then favoured by the ecclesiastical opinion of the age. In a letter to the famous Lanfranc

Berengar championed the view of the alleged Scotus Erigena.¹ With the weapons of dialectics he pulverized the notion of a transformation of the elements into the body and blood of Christ as self-contradictory; the *conversio*, he said, became an *eversio subjecti*, and the assertion that in the transformation of the substance certain qualities remained permanent, was nonsense. Similarly to Ratramnus he taught a dynamic conception of the consecrated elements as mediators of the reception of the body and blood of Christ **for faith**. LANFRANC, who was born in Pavia, after zealous studies both in law and in the liberal arts, especially in dialectics, had gathered numerous pupils at Avrenges since 1040. As a monk also, and afterwards as Abbot of the monastery of Bec, he pursued instruction in dialectics with great zeal. Subsequently he became the intimate adviser of William the Conqueror, from 1066 he was Abbot of the monastery of S. Stephen at Caën, from 1070 Archbishop of Canterbury, and died there in 1089.

On the ground of his letter to Lanfranc, Berengar was condemned unheard at a Roman synod under Leo IX., and Lanfranc, who was himself present in Rome, was not without a share in the business. A Synod at Vercelli, at which Berengar, who was arrested by King Henry I. in Paris, could not be present, next condemned his doctrine. But Hildebrand, who was residing in France, on the commission of the Pope announced himself content with Berengar's sworn declaration, that according to him the bread and wine were by consecration the body and blood of Christ, without the sense of this utterance getting the length of theological discussion. Trusting to this, Berengar himself came to Rome in 1159. But Hildebrand did nothing for him, and the party of zealots at Rome, Cardinal Humbert at their head, forced upon him the crass confession that bread and wine after the consecration were the true body and the true blood of Christ and sensuously handled by the hands of the priest, broken, and chewed by the teeth of believers (the so-called *manducatio Capernaitica* according to John vi. 52). After his return, Berengar nevertheless vindicated his conviction in great embitterment against the Popes Leo IX. and Nicholas II. In the literary controversy which now began Lanfranc strictly adhered to the idea that by consecration the elements were transformed in an inconceivable and miraculous way into the essence (*essentiam*) of the body and blood of Christ. Men like EUSEBIUS BRUNO of Angers sought in vain to mediate. In the continuation of the controversy Berengar came into danger of his life at the Synod of Poitiers

¹ In reality of Ratramnus, *De eucharistia*.

(1075). Gregory VII. summoned him to Rome, and at the Synod of 1078 appeared to be content, as formerly at Tours, with a simple positive confession without theological explanation. But under pressure of the extreme party, in the following year he required a confession of the doctrine of the substantial transformation, and when Berengar, appealing to his former conversation with Gregory, would also have transformed the significance of this confession in accordance with his opinion, he was obliged without further parley to submit and make the confession in the required sense of his opponents. Gregory commended him to the protection of the bishops of Tours and Angers and threatened with the ban all who should lay violent hands on him. Although after his return Berengar regretted the denial of his conviction, he remained unattacked on the island of St. Cosme near Tours till his death in 1088.

In the conflict with Berengar, Lanfranc made use of the dialectical method in the theological sphere, but still rather as a weapon of defence against attacks, without applying it comprehensively and on principle for the development of dogmatics. The ecclesiastical view of transubstantiation which was attacked by Berengar was next thoroughly developed by ALGER, the Liège schoolman (who died in 1130 in monastic retirement in Clugny). Keeping at a distance from the new dialectical movement, he attempted to show the foundations of dogma, more in the sense of the Fathers. Opp. MI. 180.

So likewise RUPERT of Deutz (*ob.* 1135) essentially abstained from modern science. In him there lives the theological speculation, drawn from the Fathers, especially Augustine, which, unconcerned with the formalism of the dialectical scholastic method, finds the highest divine aim of the world in the central idea of the Incarnation, and out of it develops with mystical fulness of assurance the transmission of the divine powers through the sacraments of the Church. Opp. MI. 167-170; BACH, *l.c.*, II. 245; R. ROCHOLL, *R. v. D.*, Gütersloh 1886.

2. Anselm of Canterbury.

Sources: ANSELM *opp.* ed. GERBERON, Paris 1675 (MI. 158, 159). Chief writings: *Monologium* and *prologium* (Being of God and the Trinity), *Dialogus de veritate* (Realism), *Cur deus homo* (frequently edited) ed. FRITZSCHE, 2nd ed., Zür. 1886, *De conceptu virginali et originali peccato*, *De libero arbitrio*, *Concordia præscientiæ et prædestinationis necnon gratiæ dei cum libero arbitrio*, and several others.—*Literature:* F HASSE, *Anselm v. C.*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1843 and 1852; M. RILE, *Life and times of S. Ans.*, 2 vols., London 1883.

ANSELM, who proceeded from the school of Lanfranc, was, like his teacher, vividly penetrated by the ecclesiastical ideas of the age and worked and suffered for them. Not from any sceptical tendency whatever, but in believing devotion to the faith of the Church and at the same time in cheerful trust in its reasonableness, he practised the application on principle of dialectical argumentation to the

ecclesiastical belief presupposed as given. This it was which made him the **father of Scholasticism**.

ANSELM, born at Aosta in Piedmont in 1033, sought by breaking with the world and surrendering his worldly possessions to satisfy his inward nature in the monastery of **Bec**. Devoted to zealous studies, he at the same time overcame an inclination to distinguish himself independently, by the strict exercise of monastic obedience. In 1063, when Lanfranc took over the monastery of Caën, he became Prior, and in 1078 Abbot, at **Bec**, and here he gained great influence as a teacher and pastor. His elevation to the archiepiscopal See of **Canterbury**, which ensued after Lanfranc's death and a vacancy of the See lasting for several years, brought him, the decided adherent of the principles of Gregory VII., into grave conflicts with William II., who was accustomed strictly to maintain and at the same time to take pecuniary advantage of the feudal dependence of the bishops and the royal influence on the clergy and Church. Exiled from 1097, he was indeed recalled under Henry I., but again compelled to reside abroad (in Italy) for several years, till the settlement of 1106 was finally arrived at (*vid. sup.* p. 262). Anselm himself then temporarily exercised the administration of the kingdom; in 1109 he died.

An ecclesiastical temperament and inward purity are harmoniously united in Anselm as in Augustine with an energetic impulse towards scientific knowledge. His acute dialectical speculations all rest on religious needs; **not doubt but love of divine things** is the motive force in his theology, and this prevents him from losing himself in mere formalism. His **proof of the being of God** assumes the form of prayer. Following the steps of AUGUSTINE, who had a most important influence on him, he utters the dominant principle: **fides quærit intellectum**. Faith is that which stands firm from the first, and which will remain unshaken, even if the aim of knowledge is not attained. But faith involves the impulse and the obligation to strive after knowledge. Naturally this presupposed faith is at once the entire sum of the explicit belief of the Church; the latter is the unshakeable rock. In humble surrender to it **experience** and **purification** of the heart are attained, the fruitful way to knowledge. *Qui non crediderit, non experietur et qui expertus non fuerit, non intelliget* (Isaiah vii. 9, *Vulg.*). It is still, therefore, with all confidence in the weapon of dialectics, not the one-sided trust in the mere operation of the understanding, by which the bold faith in the knowableness of the revealed truth and the unfolding of the faith as the highest reason is here nourished. Far-reaching scientific investigations, on the one hand into the being of God and free will, and on the other into original sin and especially into the atonement, the necessity of the death of Christ for the redemption of humanity, spring up on this soil. But with Anselm the dialectical working up of ecclesiastical doctrine did not yet extend to the

whole of ecclesiastical dogma, or to an attempt at rational construction of the body of ecclesiastical doctrines of the faith. The particular investigations were only to be *exempla meditandi de ratione fidei*.

But Anselm's controversy with ROSCELIN (Rucelin), a Canon of Compiègne, shows how occupation with dialectics gives rise to a philosophical question of principles.

In the *Isagoge* of Porphyry, which was much made use of in the Middle Ages, the question had been suggested, but not decided, whether *genera* and *species*¹ have substantial (objective) existence, or exist merely in our thought, whether in the first case they are of corporeal or incorporeal nature, and whether they are separated from the individual things perceptible to sense, or only exist in and by them. Boëtius had likewise left the question undecided in the commentary on his translation of Porphyry; on the other hand in the commentary on Victorinus' Commentary on Porphyry he had decided, that common conceptions had a real existence and that both in themselves and in combination with individual things. But the question which since then has often been taken up, only rose to greater importance from the middle of the eleventh century. From that time onwards the opposition of **Realism** and **Nominalism**, both in very various forms, runs through mediæval philosophy. Realism is either taught in the sense that the universals must be conceived not indeed as separated from things, but only in them, but as constituting their proper being, or further developed in the sense held to be the Platonic, to the effect that a separate independent existence **outside** individual things must be attributed to universals. The **nominalistic** conception is linked to the presentation of Boëtius, according to which dialectics has to do with *intellectus* and *voces* in distinction from *res*, as things are grasped by the understanding (*intellectus*) and designated by words, and therefore the categories pass into the highest names and verbal designations. Hence the assertion that the *universalia* are not *res*, but *voces* or *nomina*; whereby is meant words (*voces*) only in opposition to real things, but not in opposition to *intellectus*, the mental conceptions. As early as the middle of the eleventh century, Johannes, a teacher of dialectics in Paris,² is mentioned, among whose pupils ROSCELIN is also mentioned alongside of ROBERT of Paris and ARNOLD of Laon. Roscelin appears as the champion of the co-called **sententia vocum**: the *universalia* are not *res* but mere *voces* or *nomina*, or at least mere **conceptus** (notions, representations). This tendency, subsequently called Nominalism and distinguished by the formula **universalia post rem**, saw the real in the individual existing object (particular things), but in species and genus mere products of subjective presentation, which gathers together what is similar in individual things (Conceptualism), or even mere *voces*, *nomina*, which merely have the importance of designating the sum of all individuals of the same species, an extreme conception, which it is probably incorrect to ascribe to Roscelin. Contrasted with this is the realistic conception, which gains the preponderance in the further course of the history of scholasticism, especially in the thirteenth century,

¹ The so-called **universals**; at the same time this expression originally comprehends further the so-called five *Prædicabilia*.

² In opposition to PRANTL, who would refer the notice to Johannes Scotus Erigena, *vid.* DEUTSCH, *Abälard*, p. 100, note.

since scientific knowledge is only held to be possible, if there is ascribed to the universal (that to which *ἐπιστήμη* is related) in distinction from the individual, a real existence, whether it be a separate independent existence outside the individual things and previous to them (**universalia ante rem**): the Platonic Realism, according to which every individual thing has a share in the really existing universal; or whether it be only *in* the individual things (**universalia in re**). Starting from his Realism under Augustinian influence, Anselm saw in the universals the general forms of things (equivalent to ideas, though he does not use the name) which exist in the divine intelligence, the *λόγος*, and in which individual things share. Thus the main importance fell upon the supersensuous, and the birth of the theology seemed to him to depend on this Realism (equivalent to Platonic Idealism), while in Roscelin's Nominalism he feared to discover the denial of all supersensuous reality and a coarse sensualism.

The controversy between Anselm and Roscelin, which thus showed a perspective of the philosophical development of subsequent times, did not for the rest arise independently about this philosophical question, but was merely made use of as a weapon in a controversy on points of ecclesiastical doctrine. Roscelin's utterances on the doctrine of the **Trinity** raised offence and caused Anselm to be involved, Roscelin having appealed to him and Lanfranc. A synod at Soissons in 1092 compelled Roscelin to recant. By his assertion that the three Persons of the Godhead might not be designated *one* thing (nature), Roscelin appeared, on the ground of his Nominalism, so to lay the chief weight on the separate reality of the three Persons as individuals, as to fall into the prohibited Tritheism.

On another point also it was shown how the use of what at first was mostly formal dialectics might involve the seed of metaphysical speculation, viz. in Anselm's undertaking to draw the proof for the existence of God from the idea of God as the most perfect Being (the so-called Ontological proof). The monk GAUULO had attacked Anselm on this subject in the treatise "*pro insipiente*," and Anselm had defended himself in his "*Apologeticus contra Gaunilonem*."

Among the pupils of Anselm, mention must be made of ANSELM of Laon, who taught in Paris from 1076, and afterwards as archdeacon and scholasticus at Laon. Also GUIBERT of Nogent (p. 332) belonged in Bec to Anselm's pupils. The further step, of treating the whole of dogmatic theology in syllogistic form, with dialectical development of the reasons *pro* and *contra*, was made by HONORIUS AUGUSTODUNENSIS, who lived in a South German monastery in the time of Henry V.,¹ in his *Elucidarius s. dialogus de summa totius christianæ theologiæ*.

¹ Augustodunum is traditionally recognised in Autun in Burgundy, but weighty considerations seem rather to point to Augsburg, *vid.* STANONIK in ADB. and Wattb., II. 230; that Honorius is the author of the *Elucidarius* is shown by BACH, *DG. d. MA.*, II. 305.

3. Abelard and Gilbert.

Sources : ABELARDI Opp., Paris 1616 ; VICTOR COUSIN, *Ouvr. inédits d'Ab.*, 1836 : id., *P. Abelardi opp.*, Paris 1849 and 1859 ; Ml. 178 after Cousin I., hence much from Cousin II. is wanting.—On GILBERT : Otto Fris. *de gest. Frid. primi*, I. 46 and 50 (MGS. XX. 524) ; Gaufredi *libellus contra Gilbertum* (Ml. 185, 617) ; *Histor. Pontif.*, MGS., XX. 522.—*Literature* : COUSIN, *Introd. to the Ouvr. inédits.* ; CHARLES de RÉMUSAT, *Ab.*, Par. 1845 ; WILKENS, *P. Ab.*, Gtting. 1855 ; BITTCHER in *ZhTh.* 1869 and 70 ; REUTER, *G. d. A.*, I. 183 ; S. M. DEUTSCH, *P. Ab.*, Lpz. 1883 ; LIPSIVS, *Gilbert in Ersch und Gruber.*

PETER ABELARD, born in 1079 at Palais (Palet) in Brittany, a pupil of Roscelin, whom he did not specially highly esteem, afterwards of WILLIAM of Champeaux, the archdeacon of the diocese of Paris and scholastic, put himself forward as a teacher of dialectics at one time in Melun and afterwards in Corbeille itself, attracted numerous disciples to the Mont Ste. Genevieve near Paris, and fell into controversy with William of Champeaux, who meanwhile had entered the Abbey of the Canons of S. Victor. He studied theology under ANSELM of Laon, but soon thought himself superior to him also and found enormous concourses to his theological and philosophical lectures in Paris. After his unfortunate love relations with Héloïse, the niece of Canon Fulbert, he entered the monastery of St. Denis ; Héloïse took the veil at Argenteuil, but remained in continuous philosophical correspondence with him. He was obliged at Soissons (1121) to throw into the fire a treatise on the Trinity which raised offence, and was placed in monastic confinement. After his release he fled from the monks of St. Denis, whose patron saint, St. Dionysius, he had critically attacked, and founded in Champagne, between Nogent sur Seine and Troyes, the oratory of the Holy Trinity, S. Paraclete, whither the reverence of his disciples, but also the hostility of his opponents followed him. He passed several years as abbot of a monastery of St. Gildas at Rhuys in Brittany in fruitless conflict with his disorderly monks. His foundation of the Paraclete he had given over to Héloïse, who according to his direction led a monastic life with a few nuns. He then took up his work as a teacher in Paris, again with brilliant success. An assembly of bishops under Bernard rejected a series of his principles, and, when Abelard, at Sens in 1141, instead of defending himself appealed to the Pope, pronounced their rejection. Innocent II., guided by Bernard, condemned him to perpetual monastic confinement. Abelard, having fallen sick on his way to Rome while staying with Abbot Peter of Clugny, allowed himself to be induced to a reconciliation with Bernard and to a kind of retraction of his principles, was permitted with the papal approval to become a Clugniac monk, and

died on the 21st April, 1142, in the Priory of St. Marcel near Chalons sur Saône.

Abelard presented to the eyes of the time the destructive power of a bold metaphysic and the danger of an at least formal release from ecclesiastical authority. He came into a certain opposition to Anselm's *fides præcedit intellectum*, and was ardent against those who concealed their own uncertainty behind ostensible zeal for the faith, against a blind faith in authority, behind which any idolater might likewise entrench himself against any refutation. In this way, he said, there arose only a weak and non-lasting faith : *qui cito credit, levis est corde et minorabitur* (Sir. xix. 4). It was a matter of great importance to him to oppose to the blind faith in authority, the faith which was grounded on rational and moral motives, and for this purpose he expressly gave prominence to the element of knowledge contained in every belief. On the other hand he certainly did not cease to work ardently against the arrogant assumptions of the dialecticians, their contempt of all authority, and the folly of their self-exaltation. The critical tendency of his theology is indirectly revealed in the treatise **Sic et non** (completely edited first by HENKE and LINDENKOHL, Marburg, 1851), a comprehensive collection of Biblical and patristic passages on dogmatic and other theological questions in 158 sections. The apparently or really opposed utterances are here gathered together without distinction, and as the decision is reserved, the impression, which may at first only have had in view the incitement of research, can only have the predominant effect of shocking simple faith in the unanimity of the ecclesiastical tradition of doctrine. In the **Dialogus inter philosophum, Judæum et Christianum** (ed. RHEINWALD, Berlin, 1831), a Jew, a philosopher and a Christian dispute about the true religion, and in doing so the philosopher appears to be superior to the Jew. The whole dialogue, although aimed at giving the Christian the deciding word, shows, at the same time, how in the rational discussion of the value of the different religions the exclusiveness of the ecclesiastical claims is broken through, and the decision in favour of Christianity is sought in rational and moral ideas of a universal sort. Certainly the ancient philosophers are also otherwise ranked highly by Abelard, and in a certain sense conceived as equally inspired with the prophets, and their idealized portraits are held up, especially in regard to morality, to the shaming of secularized Christianity. It is also asserted that the substance of the Christian faith might in considerable part be drawn from reason; on the other hand it is certainly at the same time recognised that human knowledge of these things is not one which exhausts their nature or is logically convincing.

Offence at the arrogant dialectics of Abelard and his disciples led at first to attacks upon his tractate on the **Trinity**, which we must probably recognise in the five books of the *Theologia Christiana*, attacks which led to his condemnation at Soissons (1121). Abelard's discussions on the doctrine of the Trinity were partly the outcome of his controversy with Roscelin, with whose tritheistic conception his own more modalistic was contrasted. At the same time appeal to heathen authorities gives occasion for discussions of the knowledge of truth possessed by the heathen even in divine things, and the prospect of salvation which was not denied to them, and the rational foundation of the doctrine of the Trinity gives opportunity for utterances as to the competence of reason, even in the theological sphere, and its limits.

The "**Theologia**" which is often quoted by Abelard, from which the sentences condemned at Sens (1141) are taken, was probably a more comprehensive

cursum theologiæ of Abelard, of which a fragment is preserved in the **Introductio ad Theologiam** (three books, the last incomplete) which here and there is closely parallel to the **Theologia Christiana**, and on which the *Sententie* (edited by RHEINWALD under the title *Epitome*, Berlin, 1835) rest as a compendium composed thereafter. Also the *Sententie Rodlaudi Bononiensis magistri* which are extant in MS., according to Denifle's demonstration (ALKG., I. 402), are a revision of this *theologia* of Abelard's by the subsequent Pope Alexander III. In the treatise, "*Ethica seu liber dictus scito te ipsum*," the nature and the forgiveness of sin are treated in a manner which lays the main stress on the subjective side of moral responsibility and disposition, and which was calculated to raise offence both as regards original sin and as regards the ecclesiastical estimate of good works.

GILBERTUS PORRETANUS (de la Porret), a teacher in Paris, from 1142 Bishop of Poitiers (*ob.* 1154), a pupil of Anselm of Laon, had still stood on the side of the opponents of Abelard at Sens in 1141, who on his part attacked Gilbert's doctrine of the Trinity in the *Theologia Christiana*. Abelard had called to him warningly at Sens: *tunc tua res agitur, paries dum proximus ardet*. As a matter of fact, in the attempt more nearly to define the doctrine of the Trinity by means of philosophical dialectics, he fell into contradiction with the champions of the traditional doctrine of the Church.

Starting from the standpoint of Realism, in his commentary on Boëthius *De Trinitate* he roused similar offence to that which Roscelin had raised starting from Nominalism, and showed how almost unavoidably the attempts to apply dialectical subtleties to the doctrine of the Church must bring the patristic doctrine into doubt on some point or other. The proceedings against him which were begun at Paris were continued at the great Synod at Rheims (1148) in the presence of Pope EUGENIUS. But Gilbert found important support among the Cardinals themselves against Bernard's heated attacks, and the Pope only required that Gilbert should alter certain phrases in his book according to the standard of a creed propounded by Bernard, and he was not further molested.

4. Bernard of Chartres and William of Conches.

Sources: BERNH. SILVESTRIS *ll. 2 de mundi universitate s. megacosmus et microcosmus* ed. BARACK et WROBEL, Innsbruck 1876. GULIELMUS DE CONCHIS, *Philosophia mundi*, Max. B. P. XX. (under the name of Honor. Aug.)—Literature: REUTER, l.c., II. 4 sqq.

Other scientific efforts of the time to a certain extent continue the humanist traditions, an "early Renaissance of the twelfth century." The theological condemnation of heathen antiquity had received a strong counterpoise not only in the scholastic pursuit of the *artes liberales*, but also in the constant reading of the ancients. Thus HILDEBERT of Lavardin, Bishop of Mans, subsequently Archbishop of Tours (*ob.* 1134), had attained to a treatment of moral philosophy, which, in entire independence of theological points of view, was based upon Cicero, Seneca and others, while theologically he ap-

proached pretty closely the spirit of Anselm. BERNARD SILVESTER, teacher of the school of Chartres (hence also B. Carnotensis) lived in his world of philosophy and poetry and for a Platonic view of the world, without attacking ecclesiastical doctrine, but also without attempting to adjust the disparate elements. He exercised an important influence on outstanding men like JOHN of Salisbury and Gilbert. His pupil, WILLIAM of Conches did not exercise a similar restraint, but transformed the Biblical history of creation in accordance with his cosmological ideas of an antique tinge, and when he was accused to Bernard by the Cistercian abbot William THIERRY, agreed to retract.

5. Bernard of Clairvaux and the Victorines.

Sources: On Bernard *vid.* p. 351; HUGONIS a S. Vict. opp. Ml. 175-177, and in addition HAURÉAU, *Les œuvres de Hugu de S. V.*, Paris 1886.—*Literature:* LIEBNER, *H. v. St. Vict.*, 1832; ejdm. *Programme über Richard von St. Vict.*, Gttg. 1837-38; ENGELHARD, *Rich. von St. Vict. und Johann Ruysbroek*, 1838; KAULICH, *die Lehre des Hugo von St. Vict.*, Prag 1864.

1. Bernard was led to his stout resistance to such phenomena and especially to the arrogance of dialectics by his vigorous, positive churchly attitude, that is to say by the interest of the unshakeable character of the Church's faith. The warmth of his mystically tinged piety, the accentuation of loving devotion to the divine in self-denial and mystical contemplation, the high value which he put upon inward experience of union with the Godhead, resisted the cold dialectical elaboration of religious subjects and the philosophical self-confidence, which appeared as profane arrogance.

Against Abelard *vid.* the *Tractatus de erroribus Petri Abelardi*; for his mysticism, the treatise *De diligendo Deo* and his sermons on the Song of Songs; for his ecclesiastical attitude, the above described treatise *De consideratione*. His 400 letters exhibit the ecclesiastical activity of one of the most influential men of the age, who was already canonized by Alexander III., and in 1830 was placed by Pius VIII. among the *doctores ecclesie*.

2. The ecclesiastical disposition in alliance with dialectical argumentation and speculative contemplation found a new scientific representation in the school of S. Victor at Paris. Here worked Bernard's friend Hugo of S. VICTOR (the *alter Augustinus* or *lingua Augustini*), by birth Count of Blankenburg, who as a younger contemporary of Abelard, died while still rather young in 1141.

The onesidedness of the new philosophic tendency of the age was in his case modified, firstly, by the pursuit of a richer empirical knowledge, which received a kind of encyclopædic organization in his *Eruditio didascalica*; secondly, by the tendency to present dogmatics in a more systematic form in his *Summa*

sententiarum, a positive counterpart to Abelard's *Sic et non*, and still more in his chief work *De sacramentis Christianæ fidei*; thirdly, by the fact that he strove to rise from the rational (dialectical) treatment of the doctrines of the faith to a mystical contemplation, in which all scientific knowledge of the faith comes to rest through religious exaltation to God and union with Him. Thus cultivation of mystical contemplation after the model of Augustine and the Neo-Platonic mysticism of the Areopagite, attained decided preponderance in his pupil RICHARD of S. Victor, the *magnus contemplator*, in whom mysticism develops into ecstasy or rapture.

6. The Ecclesiastical Dialecticians.

Sources: ROBERTI PULLI Opp., Ml. 186; PETRI LOMBARDI Opp., Ml. 191-92; ejdm. *libri IV. sententiarum* ed. Joh. Aleaum, Lov. 1546 and frequently: PETRI PICTAVIENSIS *Sententiæ*, Ml. 211.

The methodical dialectical elaboration, such as even Hugo by no means disdained, gained, in spite of all the ecclesiastical resistance by means of closer attachment to dogma, the importance of a powerful weapon in the armoury of the Church. ROBERT PULLEYN (Pullus), a teacher in Oxford and Paris († about 1150), was even praised by Bernard for ecclesiastical orthodoxy. PETRUS LOMBARDUS, a native of Novara, educated in Bologna and Paris, finally in 1159 bishop there, and who died in 1160,¹ is the author of the famous four Books of Sentences, the *Magister Sententiarum*.

These sentences, similar compilations of which were also made by Hugo and Robert Pulleyn, combine to a certain extent the old sentence-theology (*theologia positiva*, compiled from sayings of the Fathers) with the new theology founded on reason and research. Questions and doubts are put forward and solved by the help of the ecclesiastical authorities, with an effort after scholastic completeness; contradictions in the authorities are adjusted by dividing the conceptions and adducing grounds for and against.

The prudent attitude of the Lombard did not, however, prevent his being attacked in reference to individual assertions. Thus the Nihilianism² of which he was accused was combated at Tours in 1163, demurred to by Pope Alexander III., and probably already repudiated at the Third Lateran Council in 1179. But its prudent attachment to authorities, moderate judgment, and on the other hand its satisfaction of dialectical necessity, procured the book permanent esteem. The deeper questions of principle, such as had been discussed by Anselm, Abelard and Hugo, questions as to the relation between reason and revelation, philosophy and theology, are only touched upon, and the scholastic elaboration of positive dogmas satisfies the needs of the Church. The so-called *Summa*

¹ So according to NITZSCH, RE., VIII. 744; usually given as 1164, famous four Books of Sentences, the *magister sententiarum*.

² The doctrine that by the Incarnation God "had become nothing," *vid.* BACH, II. 200; HEFELE, V. 616 and 719.

theologica magistri BANDINI, is not, as has been thought, the source for Peter the Lombard, but an abstract from his sentences. Among his pupils, PETER of Poitiers, Chancellor of the University of Paris, distinguished himself till towards the end of the century.

7. Reactions against the Modern Theology.

Sources : GUALTHERUS a St. Victore, *Contra novas hæreses, etc.* (c. IV. *Francia labyrinthos*), extracts in BULEUS, *Hist. univ. Paris*, II. 402 and 629 sqq.. and in EHRLE in ALKG, I. 366; cf A. PLANCK in StKr. 1844; GERHOH opp., Ml. 193-94, new ed., begun by Scheibelberger, I., Linz 1875; ARNO REICHERSB., *Apologeticus c. Folmarum* ed. C. WEICHERT, 1888; JOH. SARESBERIENSIS opp., ed. GILES, 1848, Ml. 99; ejdm. *Entheticus* ed. PETERSEN, Hamb. 1843.—*Literature* : J. BACH, II.; H. REUTER, *Joh. von Salis-bury*, 1842, and ejdm. *Alexander III. u. G. d. Aufkl.*; SCHARSCHMIDT, *Joh. Saresb.*, 1862; H. NOBBE, *Gerhoh v. Reich.*, Lpz. 1881; J. STÜLZ, *Denkschriften der WA.*, I. 113; LOEFFLED, *Gerhoh* in the KL,² 5, 378.

Bernard was specially impelled to take measures against the new wisdom by the exertions of Abbot William of Fleury, who held that the supernatural truths of the Church's faith were only to be grasped by the organ of faith. In a similar sense WALTER of Mortaigne, afterwards Bishop of Laon (*ob.* 1174), combated the new movement in France, as did with special passionateness WALTER of S. Victor, Prior of this foundation (*ob.* 1180), who directed his attacks against the four labyrinths of France (Abelard, Lombardus, Petrus Pictav. and Gilbert). But in Germany, GERHOH (Gerhoch and Geroch), canon and scholastic in Augsburg, afterwards in the Augustinian monastery of Raitenbuch, from 1132 provost of the foundation at Reichersberg on the Inn (*ob.* 1168), and his like-minded brother ARNO, Dean of the same foundation (*ob.* 1175), offered obstinate opposition to the new movement, in the spirit of the older mystico-realistic theology drawing from the Fathers.

Gerhoh, an enthusiast for the reformation of the Church against secularization of every kind (*De investigatione Antichristi*), and likewise active in favour of the canonical reform of the clergy (*vid.* p. 100), stood essentially at the standpoint of Rupert of Deutz (*vid.* p. 370), whom he venerated, and was in touch with the sentiments of Hugo, Bernard, and William of Thierry. Dialectics, he said, ought not to encroach upon the sphere of the supernatural truths of the faith, otherwise, like the two smoking firebrands (Isa. vii. 4), Abelard and Gilbert, it would revive all the older heresies. As a matter of fact the central conception of the Incarnation and the physico-mystical transference of the divine life into humanity which was accomplished by it, were threatened by the danger of analysis by dialectics, which aimed at the distinction of ideas and started a new **Adoptionism** or Nestorianism. Given a bald distinction of the divine and the human nature in Christ, it is impossible to arrive at either a real incarnation of the Godhead or a deification of humanity. So likewise their distinctions led with a certain necessity away from the patristic formulas on the Trinity

and into dangerous problems. As early as from about 1126 Gerhoh raised his voice against the new philosophy, and even addressed the popes. But on German soil, FOLMAR, the Provost of the Canonry of Triefenstein in Franconia, gave him offence chiefly by his resistance to the grossly sensuous view of the presence of Christ in the Supper. Folmar was obliged to confess at an ecclesiastical assembly, that not only the true, but also the whole complete body of Christ was present on the altar, and that in reality and entirety the substance of the body of Christ was received, though under a strange form. The opposition on the Christological question emerged in the continuation of the polemic of the Reichensberger against Folmar, and the dialectical tendency which was cultivated at the school of Bamberg under Bishop Eberhard. Gerhoh regarded Folmar and his followers as new Adoptionists, and Gerhoh was accused of Eutychianism. At a conference at Bamberg in 1158, the modern tendency, which departed from the foundations of the otherwise dominant Cyrillian Christology, came out so strongly that Gerhoh's views were repudiated here, and in 1162 at Friesach in Carinthia, under the presidency of Archbishop Eberhard of Salzburg. But Gerhoh, who had combated for his views with all the popes since Honorius II., exerted himself to force Alexander III. also to a decision in his favour. He was able to find satisfaction in the procedure of Alexander III. against the French dialecticians (synods of Tours in 1163, Sens 1164), and Alexander gave him signs of recognition. But the Pope carefully guarded himself against giving a desired decision "in such nice questions, from which no great advantage was to be expected for the Church."

The attitude of JOHN of Salisbury (*Saresberiensis*, also called *Parvus*) towards the modern theology was essentially of a different character. Although also a pupil of Abelard's and other dialecticians, he resisted the one-sided predominance of the dialectical formula and its superficializing influence. He proved his ecclesiastical disposition in his influential position with the archbishops of Canterbury (including Thomas Becket), his intimate relations with the popes and his lively participation in the ecclesiastical conflicts, finally from 1176 as Bishop of Chartres. His many-sided classical training, sprung from the school of Chartres and the instruction of William of Conches, led to a richer and harmonious intellectual culture, in which classical and ecclesiastical influences are united in a high degree.

The **Entheticus** (also *Nutheticus*) *s. de dogmate philosophorum* is a moral and satirical didactic poem, the *Polieraticus s. de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum* is a practical philosophy for public life in the State and the Church, which is intended to lead from vanities and abuses to a wholesome form of life and a sound disposition. The *Metalogicus* (*Metalogicon libri IV.*) leads to a true appreciation of science in opposition to mere logical formalism. His letters are of extraordinary importance for the history of the time.

8. Alanus ab Insulis.

Sources : Alani opp. ed. VISCH, Antwerpen 1684 (Ml. 210).—*Literature* : *Histoire littér. de la France*, XVI. 396; DUPUY, *Alain de Lille; études de philos. scholast.*, Lille 1859.

All the exertions on the ecclesiastical side to dam up theological and philosophical science failed to reach that end, particularly as the latter afforded too powerful a support to the ecclesiastical consciousness. Pre-eminent among the men who, towards the end of the twelfth century, gathered together the various scientific elements of the time in the service of the Church, is the "*doctor universalis*" ALANUS ab Insulis (from Lille or Ryssel in Flanders), a man who, if on other grounds he is to be identified with Alanus of Auxerres, belonged to the Cistercian Order, to which he again retired as a monk for the long remainder of his life (*ob.* 1203). From the Order which opposed with special zeal the heretics who menaced the Church, and which was utilised with special satisfaction by the popes for ecclesiastical services, there would on this supposition have proceeded a man who was bold enough to undertake to controvert and convince of the truth of the fundamental notions of Christianity Mohammedans, Jews, and heretics, in accordance with the doctrine of the Church, but in neglect of all authorities which they did not acknowledge, by pure reason, through the definition of ideas and argumentation.

This was the aim of the treatise *De arte et articulis Christianæ fidei*, which, indeed, acknowledges that this way to the **generation** of faith is inadequate, as the *meritum* is wanting to faith when the *ratio* affords a conclusive demonstration. Of kindred nature are his *Regulæ de sacra theologia*. The much-praised allegorical poem **Anticlaudianus**, *s. de officio viri boni et perfecti*, exhibits the blending of the humanistic and the ecclesiastical. On the *Summa quadripartita contra hæreticos sui temporis*, *vid. infra*. The effort after a theology of rational demonstration already proclaims the new influences of extra-Christian philosophy which were flowing into Christian scholasticism. He already utilises the pseudo-Aristotelian, neo-Platonically tinged book *De causis*.

THIRD PERIOD.

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

The Sects Hostile to the Church.

Sources: C. DUPLESSIS d'Argentré, *collectio judiciorum de novibus erroribus, qui ab initio XII. sæc. usque ad a. 1632 in ecclesia præscripti sunt et notati*, Paris 1728; PETRI VEN., *epistola adversus Petrobrusianos*, Ml. 189, 719; HUGO ROTOMAGENSIS (1145), *contra hæreticos sui temporis libri III.*, Ml. 192, 1255; EKBERTI *sermones XIII. adversus Catharorum errores*, Ml. 195, 11; EVERVINI præp. Steinf., *epist. ad Bernhardum*, Ml. 182, 676; VIGNIER, *recueil*, copied in USHER, *de christianar. ecclesiar. successionem* at the end of his *Antiquitates*, p. 226; BERNARDUS, abb. Fontis calidi, *liber adv. Waldenses*, Ml. 204, 777; EBRARDI FLANDR., *Bethunia orundi liber anti-hæresis* and ERMENGARDI, *opusculum contra hæreticos*, both in BP. Lugd. XXIV.; ALANUS AB INS., *summa quadripart. adv. hæreses*, Ml. 210, 305; BONACURSUS (circ. 1190) *vita hæreticorum s. manifestatio hæresis Catharorum*, Ml. 204, 775; JOH. MONETA CREMON. *adv. Catharos et Waldenses*, ed. RICHINI, Rom. 1743; RAINERUS SACHONI, *summa de Catharis et Leonistis*, MARTÈNE et DURAND, *thes. nov. anecd.* V.; the so-called ANONYMUS of PASSAU of 1260, *vid.* K. MÜLLER, *Waldenser*, p. 147; J. DÖLLINGER; *Beitr. zur Sectengeschichte d. MA.*, München 1890, vol. 2; *Documents*: the extracts from the sources in GIESELER II. 2, p. 530.—*Literature*: J. C. FÜSSLIN, *unparteiische Kirchen- u. Ketzerhist. d. mittl. Zeit*, 3 vols., Lpz. 1770; L. FLATHE, *G. d. Vorl. d. Reform.*, 2 vols., 1835; U. HAHN, *G. d. Ketzer im MA.*, 3 vols., 1845; E. COMBA, *storia della riforma in Italia* I., Fir. 1881; F. TOCCA, *l'eresia nel medio evo*, Fir. 1884; J. DÖLLINGER, l.c., I.

1. As early as the beginning of the eleventh century traces are seen of a rupture with the hierarchical system of the Church. In the diocese of Chalons, LEUTHARD, a layman who boasted of a divine revelation, was zealous against crosses and images of Christ in the churches, rejected the ecclesiastical tithes and desired to distinguish between the true and the false in the writings of the prophets. A sect discovered in Orleans in 1022, and punished by death by fire, substituted a spiritual purification by means of the laying on of hands for the baptism of the Church, and a spiritual feeding for the mass, denied Christ's birth from a virgin, His redeeming passion and resurrection, the creation and the judgment, and appealed against everything which had been invented by men and written upon the skins of beasts, to the law written in the heart by the Holy Spirit. The heresy which made its appearance about the same time in the dioceses of Liège and Arras, attributed to an

Italian teacher, likewise combated the power of baptism, and especially of infant baptism, seeing that children have as yet no will or faith of their own. It despised church buildings and the cross, and taught, appealing to the evangelical and apostolic scriptures, a law of life divested of all specifically ecclesiastical requirements. Men must leave the world, tame the desires of the flesh, win a living by manual labour, injure no one, and practise love towards the brethren. But at the same time they denied the fellowship of the kingdom of God to the married. We also find elsewhere a widespread contempt of the sacraments as empty forms. A heretical society in the castle of **Monteforte** near Turin, which was investigated about 1030 by the Archbishop of Milan, emphasized sexual abstinence, even of the married, and strict fasting, rejected the eating of flesh, and required constant prayer and a life with community of goods. A violent death is held to be a security against eternal torments, hence in dangerous sickness a fellow sectarian ought to kill the sick person. To certain persons (not the priests of the church) they ascribe a power to bind and loose; they will have nothing to do with the Pope in Rome, but believe in another,¹ who is daily to visit the scattered brethren of the society over the whole world, and whose forgiveness of sins is to be humbly accepted. They give a spiritualistic interpretation to the ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity. The Milanese nobles offered the prisoners, among them the countess of the place, the choice between an erected cross and a pile of faggots, and most of them sprang into the flames.

2. The southern French heretics are already designated **Manichees** by the oldest narrators. Now the popes down to Gregory I. had to combat the real Manichees, and still longer the bishops, at their institution, were bound in a traditional fashion to be on their guard against them.² Also the Priscillianists, who are traceable on into the sixth century (I. 440), were immediately accused of Manicheism, and afterwards perhaps actually fell under its influence. But those heretical phenomena of the eleventh century show nothing specifically Manichean, and the name of Manichee appeared to be universally applicable for a society which slunk in secrecy with fundamental opposition to the entire system of the Church, and where asceticism and mode of worship suggested a dualistic background.

But in the Greek Church the **Paulicians**, **Euchites**, **Bogomiles** (*vid.* p. 237) were also combated as Manichees; a transference of the influence of these phenomena in the Eastern Church to the Latin West is early demonstrable, and very explicable from the time of the transference of these sects to the western part of the Byzantine Empire and their spread in the Slavonic world. Where-

¹ Neander and others regarded him as a designation of the Holy Spirit, SCHMIDT, also DÖLLINGER, as a real president of the society.

² *Liber diurnus*, ed. ROZIÈRE, VI., p. 261, and GIESELER, II., p. 405.

ever opposition on principle to the secularized church and its sacraments was alive, these eastern heresies found a prepared soil. And the secret immoral horrors which were alleged against the Paulicians, Euchites, and Bogomiles, might also be transferred to the western phenomena. The narratives of immorality at the nightly assemblies and the murder of the children who were the fruit of it, of the provision of a diabolical sacrament or means of magic, by the mingling of the blood of the children with the ashes of their burnt limbs, such as was imputed to the heretics of Orleans, almost exactly coincides with what Michael Psellus¹ relates of the dæmoniactal mysteries of the Euchites.

3. The heretical phenomena in the West already mentioned, to which belong further the "Manichees" who were hanged by Henry IV. in Goslar in 1052, and who abominated all flesh food, fell more into the background in the second half of the eleventh century in presence of the vigorous ecclesiastico-political movements, but make their appearance at the end of the century about 1090 at Agen, and then again from 1115. But in the twelfth century there chiefly appear **phenomena of an ecstatic character**, which, filled with hate of the Church and the degenerate clergy, seek to replace the ecclesiastical institutions by the **voice of the spirit**. The great ecclesiastical neglect on the lower Rhine, and on the other hand the promise given out by the reforming party of Gregory VII. to withdraw from the clergy who were stained by simony and concubinage, form the characteristic background for the appearance of the famous enthusiast TANCHELM in the Netherlands (1115-24), who declared the churches to be brothels and the sacraments of the Church pollutions, and, in the possession of the fulness of the spirit, regarded himself as God equally with Christ.

This individual, who was ecstatically venerated by the multitude, moved about with a body guard of armed men, with a banner carried before him, and bearing a naked sword, ready to cut down all unbelievers. As a second Christ he celebrated his betrothal with the Virgin Mary; and the sovereign spirit of this enthusiast does not flinch from the wildest extravagances. The spreading contempt for the Church even after Tanchelm's death compelled S. Norbert to appeal for help against the disturbances excited by him.

A phenomenon of a related sort was presented by the mad fanatic EUDO DE STELLA (called Eon or Eunus in France). In the ecclesiastical formula used at exorcisms he referred the words *per eum, qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos*, to himself, as lord and judge of the living and the dead.

With his adherents he appeared now at one place and again at another, for the purpose of attacking churches and monasteries. At the Council of Rheims in 1148 he persisted in his crazes and was condemned to imprisonment.

¹ *De operatione dæmonum*, c. 5, Mgr. 122, 832.

Of greater importance is the work of the monk HENRY, who came out of the Cluniac Order, and who from 1101¹ exerted himself with zeal as an ecclesiastical preacher of penance in the diocese of Le Mans, with the permission of Bishop Hildebert, against the secularization of the Church, and so stirred up the people against the luxurious higher clergy with the partial approval of the lower clergy, that the Count of Maine was obliged to take steps against him. His anti-clerical tendency was combined with ideas of Christian social reform.

Like Robert of Fontevraud he wrought specially at the conversion of the female sex, and prevailed on women of doubtful reputation to burn their robes and hair ornaments and assume coarse clothing; he did not however lead them to enter the cloister, but sought to marry them to young men among his adherents. In general he aimed at marriage reform; in it he held that regard should not be had to dowry and portion, nor, as it appears, to the difference between free and unfree.

Subsequently Henry was obliged to recant at the Council at Pisa in 1135, and was assigned for a time to the guardianship of Bernard of Clairvaux. Now, however, his further fortunes were allied with those of PETER OF BRUYS, a deposed priest, who had agitated for twenty years in the mountains of Dauphiné against infant baptism, church buildings, and the use of the cross, and further against the sacrifice of the mass and sacrifice for the dead, and against ecclesiastical singing, till, in St. Gilles in Languedoc, while burning church-crosses, he was himself burned (1137 or '38)² by the embittered populace. Peter of Clugny and Abelard designate him the most dangerous of all the heretics who threatened the ecclesiastical cultus. He seems also to have combated the fasts of the Church and monastic vows and the celibacy of the clergy. Inasmuch as Henry now attached himself to these **Petrobrusians**, he gave his preaching a keener anti-ecclesiastical tendency. Cardinal Alberich, who was sent out by Pope Eugenius against the heresy in Languedoc, called in S. Bernard to help him—whose great authority however was insufficient to overcome all the obstinate resistance. A great part of the nobility, in their hatred of the clergy, favoured the heretics, whose chief seats were the castle of **Verfeuil** near Toulouse and the town of **Albi**. Here and in **Orleans**, where Henry's preaching found a great response among the weavers (*Tixerands*, also called *Arriens*) who were inclined towards the Manichee heresy, the movement of the Petrobrusians appears to have amalgamated with the older "Manichee" heretics.

¹ *Uid.* DÖLLINGER, I. 77. ² *Uid.* DÖLLINGER, II. 81.

So-called **Apostolics** now make their appearance in various places, *e.g.* the adherents of a certain **PONTIUS** in Périgueux in Aquitaine, who live in entire apostolic poverty, reject the use of flesh as food, declare the veneration of the cross or the image of Christ to be idolatrous, despise the communion of the Catholic Church, distinguish themselves by repeated kneelings, and gain many adherents as miracle workers. In northern France a similar sect, whose centre was in the small town of **Montwimer** (in the diocese of Châlons), also spread in the diocese of Liège. They reject the sacraments and consecrations of the Church and marriage, and lay claim to be the only true Church, but distinguish different classes of **hearers**, **believers**, and the **perfect**. In Brittany (Armorica), "**Apostolici**" appear in 1145 as opponents of infant baptism, and oppose the vow of chastity of monks and canons, but on the other hand reject marriage and deny the resurrection. Appealing to 1 Corinthians ix. 5, they seem to have had women with them. In the diocese of **Cologne**, about 1146, **EVERVIN** distinguishes from a sect of a Donatist tinge, which denies the power of the exercise of the sacraments to the hierarchy involved in secular business, rejects all usages not instituted by Christ, and will only recognise marriage between the pure, a second sect, which champions the **ideal of the apostolic life** under a dualistically coloured asceticism, **Christ's poor**, who live apostolically without possessions, and desire not to rule but to suffer. In place of baptism and the mass they substitute a baptism of the spirit by laying on of hands and an apostolic breaking of bread, *i.e.* consecration of vegetable food by the offering of the Lord's Prayer, by means of which the **perfect** (*electi*) also make the body and blood of Christ, so that to them every meal on which a blessing has been asked becomes the Lord's Supper. Their **hearers** (*auditores*) are admitted by imposition of hands into the number of the **believers** (*credentes*), from which again, by the baptism of the spirit, the much smaller number of the **electi** proceeds. At their head stands a pope; their Church is alleged to have maintained its existence in secret in **Greece** from the times of the apostles.

The great spread of the new "**Manichees**," the **Cathari**¹ or **Publicans**, becomes increasingly marked.

In Flanders they appear to have demanded toleration from the Archbishop of Rheims in 1162, and eventually from the Pope himself; but King Lewis VII. is said to have threatened them with extirpation. The monk **EKBERT**, the brother of S. Elizabeth of

¹ The name used in Germany is derived by **EKBERT** from the Manichean Catharistæ (Augustine, *De hæres.*, 46).

Schönauf, gives a similar account to that of Evervin of the heretics who, in 1163, thronged over from Flanders into the diocese of Cologne. But in this case specific **dogmatic conceptions** of a dualistic character make their appearance: a docetic view of the person of Christ and the doctrine that human souls are fallen angels who find redemption through the prayers and sanctifications of the sect. The use of sexual intercourse by Adam was the eating of the forbidden tree of knowledge. Here therefore we see the influence of Gnostic doctrines from the East, which asserts itself more keenly among the Cathari of Italy. The latter are said to have been led by a certain bishop **MARCUS**, when the heretic Pope **NICETAS** from Constantinople worked among them about the middle of the twelfth century for the strictly dualistic sect of the so-called **Drugurians**, to which the **Albanensians** (named after the town of Alba in Piedmont) attached themselves, while the **Concorrezans** (after the town of Corregio near Monza in Lombardy) adhered to the Bulgarian doctrine maintaining the unity of God; a third party, the **Bagnolesians**, adopted a middle position. The above Nicetas (Niquinta) then held a council of heretics in southern France, at **St. Felix de Caraman**, near Toulouse, in 1167, for the adjustment of the various parties, and administered the so-called *consolamentum*, i.e. baptism by laying on of hands, to Catharian bishops, and thereby confirmed their acknowledgment of the strictly dualistic doctrine, which as a matter of fact becomes predominant in southern France from that time. Other presidents were also chosen and ordained for Toulouse, Carcassonne, etc.

These heretics now appear in ever larger numbers as **Cathari**, i.e. the pure (Cazari or Gazari is a corruption of the same name), especially in **Italy** and **France**, but also in Germany, and temporarily in England. In Italy they are also called **Patarini**, most probably so-called after the Pataria in Milan. In France they are also called **Publicani** or **Popelikans**, i.e. **Paulicians**; thence the name Piphili or Piphles in northern France and Flanders is probably derived. In northern France, where the Bulgarian Bogomilesian doctrine predominated, the name **Bulgari** specially appears. The names Provençals, Agennenses, Tolosates, Albigenes, and Texerans (Tisserants) are explained as local designations.

To the one party (Albanenses in Italy, Albigenes in southern France) a strict dualism is ascribed.

To the God of light and the invisible world there is opposed the God of darkness as the originator of visible things, the Prince or God of this world, who in the temptation of Christ was able to offer all the kingdoms of the world. Of the spirits of the heavenly world (angels, sometimes conceived more gnostically as emanations, sometimes more popularly as creatures) part was enticed down into this world by Lucifer, the son of the Prince of this world. They

are the lost sheep of the House of Israel, the men elect before the foundation of the world, who until they are completely purified are transferred from one body to another and cannot be lost. The creatures of the God of this world propagate themselves by carnal copulation. The God of the historical scriptures of the Old Testament is everywhere the Evil One, the originator of the distinction of sex, the cruel God who sets up dissension, whose chief instrument was Moses. In the rest of the scriptures of the Old Testament (Psalms, Prophets, etc.), they, however, partly assume the influence of the good God. Christ, the most perfect heavenly creature, entered this world for the redemption of heavenly souls through Mary's ear and appeared in an etherial body, in order after merely apparent suffering to exalt himself again to God. His miracles also, as he had nothing in common with this material world, are only to be explained spiritually. The Prince of this world works through John the Baptist and his baptism by water against the spiritual baptism of Christ. The redemption of souls is brought about by the acceptance of the doctrine of the Cathari and their imposition of hands (*consolamentum*).

The other party of the Cathari (Concorrezani and Bagnolesi) essentially adhered to the doctrine of the Bogomiles.

Here the unity of the highest God is maintained, and Lucifer alters his position to that of the elder Son of God, who, however, after the manner of the Gnostic demiurge, becomes the originator of the formation of the world and at the same time of the alienation of the spirits from God. But in the manifold mythological development of the system the dualism is practically not of a milder character than with the others, since the whole Old Testament is rejected as Satanic, and here also John the Baptist appears as the opponent of Christ. Nevertheless a trinity of Father, Son and Spirit is taught partly in the manner of the Bogomiles (Sabellian), partly in a more Arian manner.

Much more important than these speculations, which were always only accessible to few, are the tangible principles of life resting on a dualistic foundation, such especially as the rejection of marriage, which, however, to a large extent is only made applicable to the perfect members of the sect, while to the great mass of believers, who have not yet received the *consolamentum*, carnal marriage is permitted. So likewise the perfect are bound to abstinence from all animal nourishment. They are not allowed to kill any beast, reject the oath, and, for the true believers, secular government and jurisdiction have no validity, as again they must not resist violence but only suffer it. Their detestation is directed in the fullest measure upon the entire condition of the Catholic Church, which persecutes, possesses and enjoys, instead of suffering and renouncing. The Pope holds his dominion not from Christ or Peter, but from Constantine. The church buildings are not the Church, the altars are institutions of Satan from the Old Testament. The cross as the sign of Christ's shame is not to be venerated, and all the singing and bell-ringing of the cultus is to be rejected, as also the sacrament of the

Church, for which imposition of hands for the imparting of the spirit is to be substituted. This is the proper sacrament of the perfect. But as it binds the receivers to strict observance of the demands of asceticism and loses its powers when they are violated, it is postponed as long as possible by the great mass of adherents. The believers, who are to be distinguished from the mere hearers (*auditores*), limit themselves by a compact, to bind themselves along with the perfect (the invested, *boni homines*) that in case of dangerous sickness they will have the *consolamentum* administered to them (*la convenenza*). It is reported against these believers, that until the reception of the *consolamentum* they gave themselves up to so much the more unlimited and unbridled freedom; also, the assumption of the obligation with its strong opposition to the previously existing freedom is said frequently to have occasioned falling away from the sect, as one single transgression made the whole sacrament null. In order to avoid a fall, at least in many districts, recourse was had to the dubious means of the so-called *endura*, i.e. abstinence from all nourishment, starvation, especially also in the case of children, to whom in sickness the *consolamentum* had been administered to secure their recovery. The whole constitution of the community rests on the threefold gradation. The *perfecti*, who alone also can administer the *consolamentum*, are the fully authorised leaders of the community. Their obligations also include that of not eating alone, probably because no food is to be partaken of without common prayer over it, whereby it is sanctified; hence imprisoned heretics frequently rejected all nourishment. But in the course of time a heretical hierarchy was developed. There is frequent reference to a heretical pope, especially the Patarini in Bosnia seem to have had a chief authority of this sort, called also *vicarius Christi* and successor of Peter. His representative, whose duty it was to consecrate their bishops and order their communities, is noticed in southern France. But bishops stand at the head of the communities everywhere, and alongside of them a younger and an elder son. Deacons and deaconesses are also mentioned.

As regards their customs in divine worship, the **spiritual baptism** (*consolamentum*) takes place by imposition of hands and the gospel book, reading of the beginning of the Gospel according to S. John and giving the kiss of peace, in place of which, however, at the admission of women there is substituted the touching of the elbow or shoulder. Apart from a few formulas the Lord's Prayer only is used, which might only be offered by the initiated and particularly by no married person. The believers might only beg the perfect for

their intercessions. A prayer for the dead occurs, but probably not for the perfect, who were secured by the *consolamentum*, but only for the believers, who, after death, have still to pass from one body to another, till they attain to the *consolamentum*. A woman came under suspicion of heresy because in travail she had never called upon Christ or the Holy Virgin, but only on the help of the Holy Spirit.¹ A great importance attaches to the so-called **bread-blessing**, the bread of the holy prayer or bread of breaking. To the bread which was consecrated by the prayer of the perfect, in opposition to that in the church sprinkled with holy water, great power was ascribed and it was preserved to be partaken of from time to time. In times of persecution, when the perfect had fled for refuge, it was frequently brought from a great distance. It was also regarded by many as a possible means of substitute for the *consolamentum* in case of sudden mortal danger. At the solemn breaking of bread (*apparelamentum*), which was to be held every month, the perfect were at the same time honoured (*melioramentum*, also *adoratio*) by the kneeling of the believers, who supplicated them for their intercession for some good end. Only such believers were permitted to enter into the *convenenza*.

At the conferring of the *consolamentum* the sick persons presented their means in whole or part to the perfect, who, as they were to serve the community exclusively without any work, stood in need of means of support. Many believers also bound themselves to yearly contributions to them. Those who desired to enter the class of the perfect were obliged under certain conditions first to look about for those who would undertake their support.

¹ DÖLLINGER, *Dokum.*, 37.

2. The Waldenses (Pauperes de Lugduno, Leonistæ).

Sources: Rescriptum hæresiarcharum Lombardiæ ad pauperes de Lugduno etc. in W. PORGER, *Beiträge z. Gesch. d. Wald.*, München 1875 (ABAW. XIII., 1) p. 177 sqq. (= DÖLLINGER, II. 42); *De vita et actibus*, etc. in W. PORGER, *üb. d. Verf. d. franz. Wald.*, München 1890 (ABAW. 3. Cl. XIX. 3) (= DÖLLINGER, II. 92); Bernardus, abb. Fontis calidi, *lib. adv. Wald.*, Inl. 204, 777. MONETA, PASS. ANONYM and the acts in DÖLLINGER, *vid.* p. 382. DAVID of Augsburg *de inquis. hæreticor.* in PREGER, ABAW. 3. Cl. XIV. 2, p. 183. STEFANUS DE BORBONE, *de septem donis spir. sc̃ti*. in LECOY DE LA MARCHE, *Anecdotes hist.* Paris 1877. BERNARDUS GUIDONIS, *Practica inquisit.* Paris 1877.—*Literature: W. DIECKHOFF, d. Wald.*, Göth. 1851; J. J. HERZOG, *d. roman. Wald.*, Halle 1853; W. PREGER, *Beiträge* etc. and ejdm. *üb. d. Verf. etc.*; K. MÜLLER, *d. Wald. u. ihre einzelne Gruppen bis Anfang. d. 14. Jh.* Gotha 1886 (StKr. 1886, 4. 87, 1); H. HAUPT, *Waldenserthum u. Inquisition im. südöstl. Deutschl.*, Freib. i. B. 1890 (DZG. II. III.).

1. **Beginnings.** The watchword of return to the apostolic life, which was uttered in so many forms by the monastic orders, and which also received a new application in the sects already described, which ended in Catharism, is also made of universal Christian validity beyond the limits of the cloister by the Waldenses. VALDES (Valdez, also Petrus Waldus, Waldensis, etc.) was a burgher of Lyons who had become rich by finance. On the awakening of religious aspiration he caused a number of Biblical books and utterances of the most eminent fathers of the Church to be translated by two priests into the vernacular. Moved by the legend of S. Alexius, who on his wedding night left his bride and parents, and being referred to the word of Jesus to the rich young man, he gave up his means to the poor, so as no longer to serve two masters. But with complete renunciation of the good things of the world there was combined, according to the command of the Lord at the sending forth of the disciples, the assumption of the duty of preaching the Gospel. In 1177 or 1178, as it seems, he began penance, preaching the Gospel, *i.e.* preaching the precepts of Christ according to the Sermon on the Mount and the mission of the disciples. Others, men and women from the lower ranks, attached themselves to him with like vows of poverty and preached in the streets and squares, soon, also, in the churches of Lyons. Indeed, in imitation of the apostolic life they wandered about by twos without shoes (with mere wooden sandals) and without money, disdaining all fixed settlement, asking for shelter and food from those who received their word. Valdes sought the approbation of Pope Alexander III. for this apostolic preaching on occasion of the third Lateran Council in 1179. But the commission which was entrusted with their affair,

in whose name Walter Mapes, the ambassador of King Henry II. of England, treated with them, knew how to involve the simply believing, unlearned people in mere questions of scholastic theology, without comprehending their pious impulse. The Pope is said to have embraced and praised Valdes, but to have forbidden him to preach till he was invited to do so by the Church. But for a long time Valdes and his adherents did not allow themselves to be restrained, as God was to be obeyed rather than men. Then Bishop John de Belles-Mains of Lyons (from 1181) expelled them from the diocese of Lyons, and Pope Lucius III. excommunicated them with other heretics (1184). But the sect quickly spread in southern France and as far as Aragon, and on the other hand as far as Lorraine to the district of Metz and as far as Italy (Milan). In Metz they held conventicles, at which men and women zealously busied themselves with the Holy Scriptures and passages of the fathers in the vernacular, and preached. So also in Milan a *schola Waldensium* had arisen on a piece of ground presented by the commune. This however was destroyed by the Archbishop of Milan.

2. WALDENSES and HUMILIATES. *Sources*: TIRABOSCHI *vetera Humiliatorum monumenta*, Mediol. 1766, 3 vols.

The "Poor men of Lyons" must have met with success in the society of the **Humiliates** in Northern Italy; for, along with other heretics, Lucius III. condemned those "*qui se Humiliatos vel pauperes de Lugduno falso nomine mentiuntur.*" The Humiliates,¹ who make their appearance from the second half of the twelfth century, formed an association of laymen, who allied themselves for pious and social ends, at first in Milan. They were united by exercises of piety and manual labour in common. They were allowed to live in marriage and the family, but had houses in common for their assemblies. The precepts of the Sermon on the Mount gave the standard for their conception of a humble and meek life. They rejected the oath, taught the love of enemies, renunciation of revenge, and contentment, rejected all taking of interest, and out of the gains of their trade practised copious alms-giving and mutual brotherly support. On Sundays they came together to hear the word of God, which proved brethren preached to them. They also, like the Waldenses, applied to Alexander III. for confirmation of their manner of life. But Alexander, while approving their pious efforts, definitely prohibited them also from holding conventicles and

¹ They trace their origin as far back as the time of Emperor Henry II. and Pope Benedict VIII. (about 1020), on which, however, little reliance is to be placed.

public preaching, in respect to which however they made no change. We here perceive the origin of the **pauperes Lombardici**.¹ But about the same time a further development in another direction, viz. the monastic, showed itself among the Humiliates. The first house of the **Humiliate Order**, in which men and women lived in the same building, seems to have been the house "*in Breidensi agro*" in Milan (1178).² A few years later, and still under Alexander III., a society of **regular canons** came to preside over the Humiliates, and appears as their first order, while the monastic society is regarded as second and the original lay association as third. Innocent III. confirmed all three in 1201, when there is an evident effort to guard the endeavours of the third order, which were approved from the standpoint of the Church, from dreaded extravagances such as were suggested by the Waldenses. Thus Innocent transforms the rejection of the oath into avoidance of all frivolous swearing and inculcates obedience to prelates. He indeed approves of the preaching of their brethren, since according to the apostle the spirit is not to be suppressed, but places it under the supervision of their bishop and confines it to moral exhortations by their *ministri* to the exclusion of the doctrine of the faith and the sacraments of the Church. Also as regards the *privilegium* for the brethren and sisters of the second order, it is attempted to obviate suspicion against this union by binding them to the ecclesiastical rule.

3. The **Pauperes Catholici**. In a similar manner Innocent III. attempted to turn the movement of the Waldenses into ecclesiastical lines, after his predecessor Lucius III. had harshly repudiated them. He won over former Waldenses by empowering them in return for certain guarantees to continue the life of apostolic poverty, also to maintain their garb and wandering preaching in order that they might reconcile their former associates to the Church. Thus he succeeded in leading back to it DURANDUS of Huescar in consequence of the disputation at Pamier in 1206; so likewise the adherents of a certain BERNARDUS PRIMUS. The adherents of Durandus, for the most part consisting of clerks and scientifically educated persons, devoted themselves exclusively to the apostolic calling of preaching, the spiritual instruction of their friends, *i.e.* adherents, while the adherents of Bernardus Primus at the same time practised handicrafts, only not in return for stipulated payment in money.

4. The further development of the Waldenses. The efforts of Valdes, which were repudiated by the Church, had at first, in the

¹ *Chronicon Laudunense*, MGS. XXVI. 449, cf. XXIII. 396.

² TIRAB. II. 119, cf. I. 56.

assertion of the universal duty of preaching and edification by the word of God, produced phenomena of a species of conventicular exercise of the priesthood of believers, without distinction of rank, age or sex, most plainly in the religious movement in Metz about the turn of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and in Milan among the Humiliates¹ who had come under Waldensian influence. But the fundamental notion of the life of apostolic poverty very early led to the distinct formation of a brotherhood of the ascetically perfect, who, as the brethren proper, spiritually led their adherents (believers, friends).

A certain JOANNES DE RONCHO² appears as head of the **Lombard Poor** thirty years after the appearance of Valdes. In contrast to the French Waldenses, who adhered to the person of Valdes and his views, a more independent spirit was active among the Lombards, against which Valdes, accustomed to regard himself as the natural head of the society, combated in his lifetime. The effort of the Lombards to place an elected president at the head of the society was resisted by Valdes, who was also inclined to think this incompatible with the vocation of the apostolic preacher. But after the death of Valdes the French brethren no longer maintained an attitude so averse from this idea. On this and other controverted points the French Waldenses (called Ultramontenses by the Lombards) negotiated with the Italian society at a meeting in **Bergamo** in 1218, of which we have information in the rescript of the Lombards to the poor Leonists of Germany. But differences in fundamental conceptions still prevented the desired settlement. It may be connected with the harsh attitude of the founder towards them which the Lombards felt as a breach of brotherliness, that after the death of Valdes, the assertion, put forth absolutely by the French, that Valdes was "in Paradise," was only admitted by the Lombards under the protest that Valdes and a certain Vivetus were to be regarded as saved, provided they had given satisfaction before death for all their guilt and failings.

A far-reaching difference consisted in the fact that the French desired to acknowledge the capacity of the priests ordained by the Church to carry out the sacrament of the Supper, apart from their personal worthiness or unworthiness, so long as the community of the baptised retained them in office.

¹ Bernard de Fonte calido in BP. Lugd. XXIV. 1589; Albericus trium fontium, MGS. XXIII. 878; Innocent III., *Epist.* II. 141; XII. 17.

² *Vid.* the book of the citizen of Piacenza, Salvus Burce, *Supra stella* of the year 1235 in DÖLL., II. 64.

In this the sacramental efficacy was based partly on the mere power of the divine words of institution, partly on the legal ordination of the priest, partly on an immediate influence of the God-man himself independently of men. But the Lombards made the worthiness of the ministrant a condition, as Christ completes the transformation only on the prayer of the ministrant, and will not hear the prayer of an unrighteous person. They do indeed also seek a way out of the difficulty in so far as the worthy believer can really through Christ receive the sacrament even from an unworthy priest.

While therefore the French Waldenses themselves were ready to receive the sacrament from the hand of the Romish clergy, among the Lombards, in accordance with the Donatist conceptions which were widely spread among the heretics, there is exhibited a much stronger tendency towards separation on principle from the Romish hierarchy and towards the development of a permanent sectarian priesthood of their own, to which the Poor Men of Lyons also saw themselves driven by the hostile attitude of the Church. Hence the French at Bergamo also admit that the *ministri*, the "*in Christi sacerdotii ordine ordinati*," ought to be chosen from the newly converted, *i.e.* the novices of the Poor, who have bound themselves to the apostolic life, or from the friends who remain amid secular affairs (*amici in rebus*, *i.e.* *in sæculo permanentes*). While the apostolical preaching still appears to them as the peculiar duty of the Waldenses, they probably at that time still hoped by attracting Romish priests to assert a firm footing in the Christian world. As the Waldenses do not own to any deviation from the substance proper of the Church's faith, even though they reject on principle the doctrine of purgatory, of sacrifice for the benefit of the dead and of ecclesiastical indulgences, so on the other hand they unconditionally maintain the Church's baptism by water in opposition to the Cathari and attach importance to the fact that they were able to be assured of the agreement of the Lombards on the point, although we have no information on the subject, that they themselves had performed baptism. The baptized of the Church remain the object of her influence, for which reason they also hold their believers to the Church's Easter confession and to obedience to its pastors. But their conception of the life of apostolic poverty and of the duty of obeying God rather than men in their preaching, drives them into the position of a sort of apostolico-ascetic anti-hierarchy, which disturbs the priestly government of believers by its preaching and hearing confession. Their preaching to the friends or believers tends predominantly towards religious and moral conduct according to Christ's rule, the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount, and steers a course towards that view of Christianity which regards not

merely all hierarchical rights of government in the Church, but all compulsory authority in the state as incompatible with the Christian society. In the non-recognition of any legislative and judicial competence in the hierarchy, and in the claim, themselves to govern their believers by means of confession, they come into opposition to the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The time was even then just disappearing, when confession to the priest was still regarded as not absolutely necessary, and the Church was just beginning to lay exclusive claim to confession to the priest and the judicially conceived absolution through him. But the Waldenses founded the warrant of their evangelical preachers to receive confession on their apostolic life, and in so doing expressly repudiated the conception of absolution as a judicial act. Their **celebration of tables** by the presidents also received a religious character. In allusion to the blessing of the five barley loaves and the two fishes they prayed for a blessing on the bread which the president broke and distributed. This was followed, often till far on in the night, by the preachings, which were frequently held in secret places. They exhibited great familiarity with the Holy Scriptures. But the gospels, epistles and passages from the New Testament were so deeply impressed even upon the believers that many of them distinguished themselves by great knowledge of Scripture. Those, however, who desired ultimately to enter into the brotherhood of the poor (the apostolic preachers), were instructed for years.

A peculiar celebration of the **sacrament**, certainly only for the circle of the brethren themselves, is indubitably attested. It was an annual celebration on Thursday in Passion Week, which, at least till the separation of the two parties, was similarly celebrated among them all, but in such fashion that it was held not as a **Mass** (*sacrificium* and *holocaustum*), but as a simple memorial celebration, on the basis of the words of institution and without the liturgy and ceremonies of the mass. At the same time they strictly maintained that in this ceremony the body and blood of Christ were made, and in performing it the president prays God that he may become worthy to **offer** the most holy body which is adored by the angels in heaven. It is also now expressly asserted that the celebration is strictly limited to the brethren and must be kept secret from the believers. What remained over of the elements at the celebration was put away in safety till Easter and then eaten.¹ Elsewhere Easter Day

¹ The account in MARTÈNE ET DURAND, *Thes. nov. anecd.*, V. 1754, is as follows: "*but if any persons were present who asked for it they would give it them*"; which accordingly is to be understood of administration to adherents.

is mentioned as the day of the celebration of the sacrament, and the eating of the bread consecrated on the day of the Lord's Supper is designated the sign of the Waldensian heresy. The view that the Poor Men of Lyons, the proper brethren and sisters of the society, were empowered as *sandalati* (wearers of sandals) to make the body of the Lord, is further based, in the *consultatio* of the Archbishop of Tarragona (1242), on the principle that the consecration may be carried out by any righteous person, even by women, who belong to their sect, and on the additional assertion that every "holy" person is a priest.¹ This shows that even among the French Waldenses, in spite of their initial divergence from the Lombards, the view prevails which regards the efficacy of the ecclesiastical sacraments as conditioned by the freedom of the officiating priest from mortal sin. They are at least accused of holding this conviction in secret if not openly. Hence they come more and more to the point of regarding themselves as the **true spiritual hierarchy** for believers. A hierarchical organization was actually set up among them. From the end of the thirteenth century the view prevails that all the actual brothers form one order composed of the three grades, of bishops, presbyters and deacons. Without the first grade, the *ordo pontificalis*,² it would not be perfect.

The Bishop (*Major* or *Majoralis*, between which two expressions it is hard to find a fixed difference) is elected by the entire body of priests and deacons unanimously with prayer and imposition of hands, but without any other ceremonies, after he has made a confession of faith before the brethren and a secret confession of sins to the consecrator. When it is possible, the consecration is to be performed by another major, who holds the *ordo pontificalis* (a *major ordinatus*), or failing such, by an older presbyter who occupies the place of president (a *major non ordinatus*). The actual position of a major therefore extends further than the grade of a bishop (for whom *electus a deo et hominibus* is a favourite designation), but at least presupposes the grade of the presbyterate; a *diaconus* who is elected a *majoralis* must first be consecrated a presbyter. The consecration of the presbyters takes place by the imposition of the hands of the major and the entire body of presbyters, that of the deacon by the hands of the major alone, and the deacon then first takes the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. To be elected deacon a man must first have been six years in the society (DÖLL., II. 99). On the other hand no one may belong to the number of the perfect, who has not at least received the *ordo* of

These words, however, are not to be found in the accounts of BERNARDUS GUDONIS, *Practica*, p. 247, and the Acts of the Inquisition of Carcassone in DÖLLINGER, II. 7, which are traceable to the same source and coincide almost verbally.

¹ Thus we must read DÖLL., II. 7, as is shown by *Bern. Guid. Pract.*, 247.

² So we must read DÖLL., II. 97, instead of *ordo perfectionalis*, as is shown by II. 109 sqq.

deacon (*ib.* 103). The association must therefore have been comprehensive enough to include novices also. At the same time, however, the status of the *pauperes Christi* itself is attached to the consecration to the diaconate and the vows then assumed.

The fact that we hear but little of female preaching *poor-folk* is probably connected with this monastic hierarchical development. The Waldenses in Languedoc (beginning of the fourteenth century) refuse admission into their ranks to maidens and widows because they cannot preach or receive the order of the diaconate (DÖLL., II. 117).¹ A married man, even when separation from the wife has taken place by her consent, is refused admission, on the ground of Matt. xix. 6 (DÖLL., II. 104); the admission of a widower, in itself permissible, they avoid, because such a person after his previous habits of life might easily fall into sins of the flesh (*ib.* 105).

What has already been said involves that among the French Waldenses there were a number of majores, with or without episcopal consecration. Nevertheless a most highly monarchical government, and one which lasted during the life of the holder, is probable. In Languedoc a person of this sort is called *minister* or *minister major*. John of Lorraine was succeeded as minister major by a certain Christinus, a plain man of no literary education, who had already held the grade of *majoralis* during the lifetime of the former.

The history of the Inquisition shows what deep roots Waldensianism had struck and how widely it had spread in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries both in Romance lands and in Germany and the eastern neighbouring districts. There it was the French form of the sect which worked, here the Lombard. *Vid. infra.*

3. The Conflict with Heresy.

Sources: BERNARDUS GUIDONIS, *Practica* (p. 391); N. EYMERICUS, *Directorium Inquisitor.*, Rom. 1578; P. FREDERIGO, *Corpus document. Inquis. hæret. pravit. Neerlandicæ*, L., Gent. 1888; Portions of acts at the end of PH. DE LIMBORCH, *hist. Inquis.* Amstel. 1698.—*Literature:* LIMBORCH l.c.; F. HOFFMANN, *G. d. Inqu.*, Bonn 1878, 2 vols.; J. FICKER, *gesetzl. Einführung der Todesstrafe* in MOG. 1880; Ch. MOLINIER, *L'inquisition dans le midi de la France*, Par. 1881; H. LEA, *Hist. of the Inqu.*, New York, 1888, 3 vols.

1. In southern France, especially, everything seemed to rise in opposition to the Church and the hated clergy. Nearly all land-owners protected the heretics, and the church had in vain threatened and enticed at synods. At the castle of **Lombres**, near the town of Albi, an examination of the heretics had taken place in presence of the bishop at a conference with the leaders of the heretics (*boni homines*) before arbiters appointed by both sides, and the Church had been unable to take any measures against them. At that time the Cathari declared against the Old Testament, against the oath and in favour of the right of the laity to adminis-

¹ However, a certain Hugueta (DÖLL., II. 144), and indeed the wife of a Waldensian, is mentioned as *hæretica perfecta sectæ Waldensium*; also *mulieres Waldenses* perform religious acts upon a sick adherent (*ib.* 233).

ter the sacraments, and denied unworthy priests all power of the priesthood, but as further regards their doctrines maintained an attitude of entire reserve. Two years thereafter they held the assembly at St. Felix de Caraman (p. 387). Somewhat later Count Raymond V. of Toulouse, pressed by his brother-in-law, Lewis VII., called in the Cistercians to his assistance. The Cardinal Legate Peter of S. Chrysogonus, sent at the instigation of the Kings of France and England, found the church universally despised, and the heretics treated with reverence and the clergy derided. The Cistercian HENRY of Clairvaux, in the domain of ROGER II. of Beziers, proclaimed the ban against him, and, supported by Alexander III.'s demand at the Third Lateran Council (1179), enticed people to join the crusade against the heretics, which was carried out in 1181 against Roger II. but without permanent result. In 1198 Innocent III. sent his legates with the most extensive authority against the enemies of the Church in southern France. ARNOLD of Citeaux and PIERRE of Castelnau, the Cistercians employed by Innocent, tried a more spiritual method of procedure at the instigation of Bishop DIEGO of Osma, and his sub-prior, DOMINICUS, preached and disputed with Cathari in the castles of the nobles without result. But when PIERRE was murdered (1208), and Raymond VI., of Toulouse, was (unjustly) suspected of instigating the deed, ARNOLD of Citeaux, summoned King Philip of France and the French nobility to the crusade against the nest of heretics, and the opposition of northern, Norman, to southern, Romance France, the seductions of avarice and the attraction of the luxuriant country procured great accessions to the crusade. As Raymond humbled himself, even himself taking the cross against the heretics, he was at first spared, and action was taken against the possessions of Count Roger of Beziers, Carcassone, Albi and Rasez. From the town of Albi the whole heretically infected population of the country was called Albigeois (Albigensis), and Albigensis now became a heretical name, at first for all heresies attacked, without distinction, but shortly for the Cathari in particular. According to his own admission Arnold raged furiously, without sparing rank, sex or age, with murder, pillage and fire in Christ's name. SIMON de MONTFORT's thirst for territory and ARNOLD's fanaticism could no longer be restrained by Innocent himself. Simon now conquered the territory of Raymond VI. also, and caused the Synod of Montpelier (1215) to assign it to himself, and the Fourth Lateran Council confirmed this robbery. But Raymond won ground again, especially after Simon's death (1218), and his son Raimund VII. was again lord of his domain in

1222. But although the latter showed himself entirely tractable towards the Church, LEWIS VIII. of France, took the cross against him in 1226, at the instigation of Pope Honorius III. Although the enterprise was prevented by the shortly ensuing death of the king, Raymond was obliged in 1229 to agree to a peace which brought one part of his territory directly to the crown and prepared the way for a similar union as regards the other.

2. The systematic ecclesiastical persecution of the heretics, already introduced by the Third Lateran Council in 1179, was made the chief duty of the **episcopal synodal courts** by LUCIUS III., in 1184. Laymen were bound by oath to inform against all suspected persons, and negligent bishops were threatened with deposition. The Fourth Lateran Council carried these precepts into execution. Excommunicated heretics are to be given over to the secular power for punishment and confiscation of their goods, suspected persons, if they do not purge themselves within a year, are likewise to be punished as heretics, secular governors are to be bound to the suppression of the heretics on pain of excommunication. Recalcitrants are to be deprived of their territories with release of their subjects from their oath, with a view to bestowing them on Catholic masters. Protectors of heretics fall under the ban, and in case of obstinacy become incapable of holding any public office and giving evidence. On the basis of these regulations the Council of Toulouse in 1229 carried out this "episcopal inquisition." The regular auricular confession introduced by Innocent was made to support the government of the communities. The Council of Toulouse went the length of requiring all believers to communicate three times, and every two years they were to swear adherence to the Church; suspected persons were forbidden medical and other assistance. But a few years later in place of the episcopal inquisition there was introduced (by Gregory IX. 1232-33) the inquisition by special commissioners of the Pope, especially the begging friars, particularly the Dominicans, as more pliable instruments. At the same time, the secular rulers, Frederick II. as well as Lewis IX., in pursuance of the ancient view which was already rooted in the Roman (not the Germanic) legislation, placed the secular arm at the service of the Church by their comprehensive laws against heresy.

The abnormal principles of the inquisitorial method of procedure already showed themselves at the Council of Narbonne in 1235. The names of the accused and the witnesses remained concealed, criminals also and dishonourable persons were admitted as witnesses, and mere testimony was to suffice for conviction. **Torture** was

adopted from the secular process of inquisition ; indeed the spiritual inquisitors also began, for the sake of keeping the avowals secret, to practise the torture themselves instead of the secular power. According to Pope Urban IV. (1261) the spiritual inquisitors may mutually absolve each other when, by the application of secular means of force, they incur excommunication or so-called irregularity according to the canonical law. But actual practice went still further, especially in southern France, where heretics were scented everywhere, and blind passion and the most self-seeking interests loosed the reins and placed themselves above all observance of the forms of law. In Germany also, the episcopal process of inquisition was very soon pushed into the background by special papal inquisitors. The Dominican friar Dorso and the one-eyed Hans seem at first to have worked without higher credentials, by spurring the people on against the heretics, and to have decided the judges, while the clergy still complained of their action. Now, however, there followed the commission to the Dominicans, to whom also as judges of heresy Frederick II. promised his protection in the whole of Germany. CONRAD of Marburg, probably neither a Dominican nor a Franciscan, but a secular priest, standing on close relations with the popes since Innocent III., as the spiritual adviser of Landgrave Lewis IV. of Thuringia and father confessor of his wife, S. Elizabeth, enjoyed the reputation of a strict ascetic and zealous churchman ; without personal self-interest he exercised the greatest ecclesiastical influence, but in his pastoral care of the Landgravine after the death of her husband his ecclesiastical strictness developed into the rudest fanaticism, which mercilessly enslaved the pious woman and sought to make her a saint by mortifying the flesh and every tender emotion. As inquisitor he smothered all humanity in his fanaticism. Gregory IX. made him ecclesiastical visitor and censor of the clergy. The terrorism of the judge of heresy, supported by papal authority, feared neither princes nor bishops. On the most frivolous accusations he left his victims nothing but the choice of confessing and being thrust into a monastery, or denying and ending at the stake. A complaint of the rich Graf von Sayn at the Assembly of Mayence in 1233¹ led to a complaint by German bishops of him for proceeding as he did. A few days later, on his way back to Marburg (30th July, 1233), he was slain along with his companions by some nobles.

Conrad's name seems to have been unjustly connected with the notorious crusade against the Stedingers. This free peasantry on the lower Weser de-

¹ HEFELE, V. 1026.

fended themselves against the Counts of Oldenburg and were involved in the conflicts over the reappointment to the Archbishopric of Bremen, from the tithe-rights of which they sought to withdraw themselves. After Archbishop Gerhard II. had lost a battle and his life in conflict with them (1229), a synod of Bremen of 1230 declared the Stedingians heretics. Their defiance of the ban was interpreted against them as contempt for the spiritual power of the keys and the sacraments of the Church. What else is alleged against them refers merely to remnants of heathen superstition. Pope Gregory IX. summoned a crusade against the defiant peasants, which, after wavering success, led in the spring of 1234 to almost complete annihilation of the Stedingians near Altenesch in Westmarschen. E. L. Th. HENKE, *K. v. M.*, Marb. 1861; A. HAUSRATH, *K. v. M.*, 1861, and in his shorter writings; B. KALTNER, Prag. 1882; WEGELE in *HZ.*, V. 351.

3. Remembering the original spiritual vocation of the Church, Bishop Wazo of Liège in the eleventh century had protested decidedly against the application of violent means against the heretics, and in the twelfth century pious churchmen like Bernard still recoiled from the use of ecclesiastical means of force against the heretics. They were to be taken not with weapons but with reasons, but the obstinate were to be shunned according to the saying of the Apostle.

But the Church, which had long identified her ordinances with the existence of the kingdom of God, and the salvation of souls with submission to the Church, could not abide permanently at this standpoint. The vineyard of the Lord was to be protected against desolators and the authorities impelled to place their compulsory powers at the service of the Church. St. Hildegard would not hear of the killing of heretics, but summoned the governing powers to expel them and seize their goods. But after the Church, fighting for her existence, had taken the extreme step and called in the sword and the secular legislation to her help, scholastic theory also devoted itself to the vindication of the practice of the Church. According to Thomas, the Church certainly has not the right to force unbelievers (non-Christians) to believe; but she is to force apostate heretics by the use of bodily compulsion to the fulfilment of their baptismal vows. To accept the faith is indeed a matter of free will, but to maintain that which has been accepted is a matter of necessity. Heresy is a sin worthy of death, falsification of the faith worse than false coining, and deserves not merely exclusion from the Church, but also from the world. The Church can exercise mercy towards the converted heretic, but to the backsliding heretic it can only extend penance as a means of grace, but can no longer present him with life. As obedient subjection to the doctrines and precepts of the Church is regarded as the fundamental virtue of believers, but independent prosecution of questions of the faith as audacity dangerous to the soul, she must regard all discus-

sions on the faith without the leading strings of the Church with increasing aversion, bind religious edification and teaching to the authorisation of the Church, and shut out the layman from independent access to the sources of Scripture. Gregory VII., with correct hierarchical instinct, already showed himself not even inclined towards translations of the Bible into the vernaculars and general diffusion of the Bible among the laity. On this question Innocent III. still held comparatively mild and reserved opinions; but in consequence of the Albigensian movement the Council of Toulouse (1229, can. 14), which was certainly only local, moved decidedly against heresy by prohibiting the Bible. Laymen were not to possess the books of the Old and New Testament, but only along with the Breviary and the Hours of the Virgin Mary, perhaps a Psalter, and this only in the Latin tongue.¹

¹ Cf. the Council of Beziers, 1246, *can.* 30.

THIRD PERIOD.

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

The Begging Friars.

1. The Franciscans.

Sources: The Life of Francis by THOMAS of CELANO (1229), the so-called *legenda Gregorii IX.*; the *vita* of the *tres socii*, that of Bonaventura in ASB. Oct. 2. 683 sqq.; and that likewise composed by THOMAS of CELANO (Ed. AMMONI, Rome 1880), at the desire of the General-minister Crescentius; JORDANI DE JANE, *de primitivorum fratrum in Teutoniâ missorum conversatione et vita memorabilia*, ed G. VOIGT in ASGW., V., 1870, and in *Analecta Franciscana*, Quaracchi, I. 1885 (cf. DENIFLE ALKG., I. 630 sqq.) ECCLESTON, *de adventu frat. min. in Angliâ* in Mon. Franc. (Sc. r. Br.), ed. BREWER 1858, and HOWLET 1881.—*Literature:* K. HASE, *Franz. v. Ass.*, Lpzg. 1856; K. MÜLLER, *d. Anfänge des Minoritenordens u. d. Bussbruderschaften*, Freiburg 1885.

1. GIOVANNI BERNARDONE, called Francesco by his father, a rich cloth merchant in Assisi, connected with France, grew up in bright enjoyment of life amid the wanton pursuits of the opulent city youth, and after a severe illness took a profound inward turn towards religion, sought solitude, and renounced the world. On account of his lavish benevolence he quarrelled with his father, desired for the Lord's sake to forget father and mother, and poverty became his mistress, who filled him with the royal feeling of freedom from the world. On account of his eccentric nature he was sometimes regarded as mad, sometimes as a saint. Following the Lord's command, he seeks to invite men to repentance and the kingdom of God, in literal accordance with Matthew x. and Luke x., without gold or silver, without purse, shoe, or staff. The power of simplicity and humility soon wins numerous companions to a like aim. From Pope Innocent, in spite of many scruples, he obtains at least verbal permission that these *virî pœnitentiales* should continue their apostolic life according to the precepts of Francis, renouncing all property. Francis finds as much satisfaction in begging as in beneficence, but at first he directed his companions to gain what was needful for their support by manual labour but by this means only. The small, quickly increasing band at first lived at home, assembling once annually at the church of Portiuncula at Assisi. They preach repentance and renunciation of the world, and

practise mercy, the care of the sick and the like, and think of missions among the unbelievers. With this purpose Francis undertook journeys to Syria and Morocco, entirely without preparation and without any result. Five of his brethren suffered the martyr's death in Morocco in 1219. At the Whitsunday assembly, at Assisi, in 1219, the sending out of apostles to the different Christian countries was resolved upon and carried out. Francis himself went with twelve brethren to the East. Pope Honorius III. recommended and approved their manner of life (POTTH. 608).

2. After the return of Francis from the East, the need of a more permanent organization of the *fratres minores*, as they are now called, made itself felt, for which Cardinal Ugolino (afterwards Pope Gregory IX.), as protector of the young society, used his influence with Honorius III. Honorius required the establishment of a novitiate and the taking of an irrevocable vow, and sanctioned the garb hitherto worn (a simple cape with a cowl of coarse stuff, and held together by a cord). The *new rule*, which expanded the original precepts of Francis of 1209, was discussed at the Whitsunday assembly of 1221 by the society which had now increased to 3000 members. The ideal of imitating the life of poverty of Christ and the apostles has already experienced an application in different directions. Some put preaching first, others apply themselves to an anchorite life of prayer, still others practise humility and self-denial in petty labour, the fruit of which goes to the poor. A clear image of the latter is afforded by the life of S. AEGIDIUS. Thus the rule of 1221 already distinguishes between *prædicatores*, *oratores*, and *laboratores*. Priests have already entered the society, and from them the brethren receive absolution and the Lord's Supper. The organization is then perfected by the rule confirmed by Honorius III., which as yet takes no regard of the foundation of monasteries and fixed settlements. The travelling brethren enjoy hospitality, or earn their support by their services. The rule of 1221 had still uttered a warning against treating such settlements as property to be defended against others. Nevertheless *eremitoria*, or cells, are known, to which the brethren temporarily retire. The systematic sending forth of brethren to the various countries introduces new circumstances. Received into refuges and hospices, or accommodated by bishops and pastors in private houses, they also probably hire rooms in towns for their residence. Presents of ground and soil lead to the erection of convents, in which case, the alleged condition of holding no property is formally maintained, *e.g.* in England by transferring the piece of land and the buildings as

property to the town, while the brethren only claim the usufruct. In the rule of 1223, mention is no longer made of work for the purpose of earning bread, and begging as their peculiar precept is formally regulated in the fixed settlements. Now, however, the pursuit of ecclesiastical science is soon taken up, a purpose which was remote from the original intention of Francis. Francis had already in 1220 permitted his spiritual kinsman, S. ANTONY OF PADUA, who had come over from the Augustinian Canons to the Minorites, to teach the brethren theology; only, science was not to extinguish the spirit of prayer. But schools soon arise in the Franciscan convents themselves. The Franciscans find their way to the teaching chairs of Paris and Oxford, and on this side also become powerful instruments in the hand of the Church, although this is unacceptable to the original spirit of the society. It is complained that Paris has destroyed Assisi. Francis had inculcated on his followers not to trouble themselves about papal privileges and favours. Nevertheless this happened very soon, the order was favoured by the popes in every way as a useful and pliant instrument in their hands, and thereby was greatly estranged from its original ideal.

Francis himself survived to see the beginning of this great transformation, and more and more handed over the guidance of his powerfully increasing Order to the born organizer, his pupil, ELIAS of Cortona. Early worn out by asceticism and restless activity, he died in 1226, stretched on the floor of his beloved church of Portiuncula. His testament¹ is the attempt to maintain his old ideas in opposition to the rule of 1223 and the whole new development of the order. Here labour is again recommended, the effort after papal privileges censured, and the avoidance of his precepts by "glossing" the rule in the interest of more recent requirements forbidden. As early as 1228 Francis was canonised by Gregory IX.; but the crying contradiction between the rule and the actual existence of rich properties in convents and churches, led, after the discussions of the General Chapter of 1230, to Gregory's decision against the validity of the testament.² Monasticism had hitherto interpreted the vow of poverty in the sense that only the individual was to hold no property personally, but that the society as a whole might do so. This was contradictory of the thought of Francis; but recourse was had to the idea that only the usufruct of goods bestowed on it

¹ WADDING *ad a.* 1226, No. 36, also in ASB. l.c. 663, certainly incorrectly regarded by RENAN as a forgery.

² Bull of 28 Sep., 1230, in POTH. No. 6820-6827.

pertained to the order, whereby certainly it remained uncertain in many cases whose property they were. Similarly the prohibition to take money was got round by the pretext that it was only prohibited to the members of the order themselves, but not to their selected procurators. Under the new General Minister of the Order, Elias of Cortona, who was elevated in 1227, put away in 1230, and again prevailed in 1236, the worldly-wise innovations wrestled with the antique austere spirit of an Antony of Padua and the so-called **Cæsarians** (adherents of Cæsarius of Spires), till Elias, overthrown once more in 1239, working on the side of Frederick II., as an expert mediator, and finally as a decided enemy of the papal policy, was thrust out of the Church and the Order as an apostate. On his deathbed (1253) he was reconciled to the Church and the Order. But the internal contradiction of the actual secular position of the Order, with its original spirit, dragged it in subsequent times into the deepest dissensions.

2. The Second Order of S. Francis.

Sources: The Rule in HOLSTENIUS-BROCKIE, *cod. reg.*, III. 34; the *vita* in ASB. Aug. 2, 755.

CLARA SCIFI, the daughter of a highly esteemed knight of Assisi, seized by the enthusiastic spirit of S. Francis, fled in her eighteenth year from her family, and was brought by Francis, who cut off her hair, into a neighbouring Benedictine monastery, and afterwards, when like-minded persons gathered about her, into a residence near the church of S. Damian, which he had restored. The society of "the poor women" thence received the name of the Damianitesses. From Cardinal Ugolino (p. 405), in the absence of S. Francis, they received a more severe form of the Benedictine rule. But in 1224, at their pressing request, Francis gave them a rule of life of their own which Honorius III. confirmed. The "**Clarisses**," as they were now called, vowed obedience to the Pope and Brother Francis and their successors, lived in strict seclusion with much silence and work in common, and besides the walls and gardens of their cloisters were to possess nothing of their own, and live on voluntary gifts. Amid great privations the order nevertheless quickly spread. In spite of frequent severe want Clara disdained mitigations of her rule offered by Gregory IX. She only wanted to be released from her sins but not from following Christ. Nevertheless Innocent IV., in 1246, and Urban IV., still further mitigated the rule. Those who lived under the mitigated rule were designated **Urbanists**.

3. The Order of S. Dominic.

Sources: The oldest *vita* by JORDANUS (Dominic's successor) *de principiis ordinis prædictorum* in ASB., Aug. 1, 545; the legend most used in the Order itself is that by HUMBERTUS DE ROMANIS, the fifth General of the Order; the Rule in HOLSTENIUS-BROCKIE, IV. 10, and the *Constitutiones* of 1228 in DENIFLE ALKG. 1885, 165 sqq.—*Literature:* MAMACHI, *annales ord. prædic.*, Rom. 1746; QUÉTIF et ECCHARD, *scriptores ord. prædic.*, 2 voll. Paris 1719.

The **Order of Dominicans**, which by the development of history was closely paralleled with the Franciscan Order, nevertheless had an essentially different origin. Over against the "unconscious and genial" Francis, following his immediate religious impulses in simplicity of heart and glowing love, who, outwardly mean-looking in his soiled cowl, draws men's hearts by the power of his unselfish love to Christ and the poor, stands Dominic, the dignified and learned Spaniard of high Castilian family, with the aspect of one who consciously pursues an end. Born in the diocese of Osma in 1170, Bishop Diego made him a canon of his regular chapter. In his retinue he appeared in southern France on occasion of the consultations with the Cistercians at Montpellier, in 1204, with the exhortation to work by the simple method of the apostles in converting heretics, and sought to adhere to this position. Supported by Bishop Fulco of Toulouse, he assembled like-minded persons for the purpose of rescuing and converting heretics in a house presented to him in Toulouse. During the Albigenian war, there was nothing left for him but to exert himself in convincing the heretics captured by Arnold and Simon de Montfort. His petition for the confirmation of his society as a new order for the conversion of the heretics found no favour at the Fourth Lateran Council, as Innocent much rather recommended him to attach himself to an already recognised monastic rule for the prosecution of his aim. Dominic and his sixteen companions resolved to adopt the Rule of the Canons of S. Augustine, and accordingly became regular canons, following essentially the model of the Premonstratensians; in 1216 Honorius III. confirmed the "brothers preachers of S. Romanus at Toulouse," as they were called after their property there. Dominic in person undertook his obligation in presence of the Pope, and received a general permission to preach and hear confession everywhere. Honorius expressly confirmed the properties already acquired and to be acquired by the Order, which therefore was not a mendicant Order from the start. From Spain it spread to France. In Paris, from their monastery in the house of S. James, they received the name

Jacobins; in Rome, in the monastery of S. Sixtus, they conducted the reformation of the Roman nuns by commission of the Pope. The Pope assigned quarters to Dominic and his companions in a part of the papal palace, and entrusted him with the spiritual care of the numerous papal servants and household. Hence was developed the post of **magister sacri palatii**, which in subsequent times has always been held by a Dominican. In the year 1219 the Order assumed the garb of the Carthusians. Now, however, the example of the Franciscans had such an effect, that, according to Dominic's will, the **ordo fratrum prædicatorum** at the general chapter of 1220 renounced all revenues, goods, and moneys which it possessed down to the possession of the bare walls of the convents, and in imitation of the humility of S. Francis became a **mendicant** order, which desired to receive the necessities of life as alms, and forbade the admission of serving brothers, such as were usual among the canons.¹ Dominic died shortly thereafter (1221) in a monastery in Bologna, after cursing any one who should introduce secure revenues into his order.

At the general chapter at Paris (1228), under the General Jordanus, at which the *consuetudines fratrum prædicatorum* were recorded, only modest houses of a moderate height (artistic decoration for churches only) are permitted; but the holding of properties and fixed revenues, as also the incorporation of parish churches, is forbidden.² In spite of the marked transformation of the Order into a begging order, it was sought to maintain the character of the Dominicans as regular canons, as far as practicable.

Dominic was already canonised in 1234, and his Order grew with extraordinary rapidity; in the times of the great rise in the prosperity of city life, they, like the Franciscans, were easily able to find nests for themselves in the cities, as they only required a modest shelter and no fixed endowment. But they very soon loosed themselves from the obligation of poverty, and went back to the older view, that the vow of poverty only excluded individual personal property, but not the common property of the monastery, of which the individual had only the usufruct.

¹ The legend makes Dominic and Francis meet as early as the Lateran Council of 1215, and recognise each other as companions having the same aim, and Jordanus' legend makes Dominic renounce all property as early as 1215/16, which is contradicted by the resolution of 1220, which had even then to overcome opposition in the Order (against DENIFLE l.c. 179 sqq.).

² The *consuetudines*, newly revised by Raymundus de Pennafort, the third general, received their completion from the fifth general, Humbertus de Romanis.

The principle of the begging orders was adopted by other monastic societies. The **Order of Carmelites** (Elijah's well on Mount Carmel), which arose after the middle of the twelfth century through the association of hermits, under the leadership of Berthold of Calabria, received a rule from the Patriarch Albert of Jerusalem in 1219. When the position of these **fratres Eremitæ de monte Carmelo**, or **Eremitæ St. Mariæ de Carmelo** became insecure in the East, at their own desire they received from Innocent IV. the character of a mendicant order, which was to hold no property in its own monasteries. The rule, however, was mitigated by Innocent himself.

The **Augustinian Hermits**, who arose out of Italian hermit societies, also became a mendicant order under Alexander IV. (1250); for them an important position was reserved in the last centuries of the Middle Ages.

At the Council of Lyons of 1244 (can. 23) Gregory X. forbade the formation of new monastic orders. But the **Servites** (*serri b. Mariæ virg.*), who originated in Florence in 1233, and who from the very first desired to live upon alms only, were placed under the rule of S. Augustine in 1239 and were confirmed in 1255 by Alexander IV., were still recognised by John XXI. (1277) as a special mendicant order.

4. The Penitential Brotherhoods of the Mendicant Orders (Tertiaries).

Sources: in HOLSTEN-BROCKIE, III. 391, the **Regula** contained in the Bull of Nicholas IV. of 1289, and frequently erroneously ascribed to S. Francis; the Dominican Rule of 1285 *ibid.* IV., 143; the *vite* of S. Francis (p. 404), *Chronica fratris SALIMBENE Parmens.*, Parm. 1857 (Mon. hist. ad provincias Parmens. et Placent. pertin. III.).—*Literature*: K. MÜLLER, p. 404.

Joyful renunciation of the world was joined in S. Francis to the adoption of the calling of the apostolic preaching of repentance and the kingdom of God. But as with the growth of the Order the duty of preaching was soon confined to the narrower circle of those who were suited for it, so, on the other hand, the idea of the life of humility and poverty took hold also of a wider circle of those who, without entirely separating themselves from their families and the world, sought a share in this practical Christianity of the Gospel as understood by Francis. This corresponded to the spirit of the whole movement, which pressed outwards into the world beyond the fixed limits of professional monasticism. Earliest in Italy, but soon elsewhere also, there are formed **Penitential Brotherhoods** (*collegia pœnitentium*) composed of men and women, clergy and laity, maidens and unmarried men, who really desired to live as ascetics. In many cases they distributed their incomes to the poor, distinguished themselves by a special garb, even strove on the ground of their penitential life, in accordance with a strict interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount, to withdraw from the civil obligation to bear arms and enter civic office, and on this subject fell into discord with the magistrates of the cities. Popes recommend them to the protection and care of the bishops. They did indeed

form themselves according to the directions of S. Francis, and Gregory IX. (1230) already designates them the **fratres tertii ordinis S. Francisci**, and Innocent IV. entrusts their visitation and the regulation of their discipline to the Provincial Minister of the **Minorites** (POTH. 12675). But about the same time we also find such brotherhoods in association with the Dominicans. The aim of both the rival orders is to procure by their means a broad footing in the lay world. But their wide diffusion seems to have been accompanied hand in hand by a mitigation of the ascetic strictness of these brotherhoods, as again the separation from the requirements of the secular life was no longer carried out.

The attempt to ally the Tertiaries more closely with the Order proper is already exhibited by Innocent IV.'s precept to the Minorites, already mentioned. Then the Dominican General MUNIONE gave the penitent brothers of S. Dominic a rule in 1285. In contrast with this, Pope NICHOLAS IV. by his rule (Bull *supra montem* of 1286, POTH. 23044) sought to bring the whole of the other brotherhoods under the guidance of the **Minorites**, and even to enforce it on the Dominican Tertiaries: but this was rendered vain by the resistance of the Dominicans and probably also of the secular clergy. Those who pass under the Rule of Nicholas now appear as *Fratres de pœnitentia S. Francisci*.

The knightly lay brotherhood of the **Militia Christi**, who, in the circumstances of the Albigensian War, already attached themselves to S. Dominic in 1209, had a different origin. This brotherhood stands in the closest relationship with the Spanish knightly orders, especially with the knights of Ebora (*vid. sup.* p. 359): it consisted of married men and women, who lived under secular conditions in their own houses, but wore a special garb and bound themselves to the defence of the faith and the Church and the protection of the oppressed, and undertook definite religious exercises. From Toulouse and Languedoc they spread to Italy, especially to Lombardy, which was so greatly stirred by the heretics, and where the people called them the **Cavalieri gaudenti**. In 1235 Gregory IX. took such brothers of the knightly service of Christ at Parma into his protection against the city authorities, and in doing so recognises their special relation to the Dominican order (POTH. 9909-9912). A similar society of the **Militia b. Mariæ Virginis**, newly formed in Bologna, and confirmed by Urban in 1216 (POTH. 18195) developed into a formal knightly order with an affiliated brotherhood. A certain approximation between the penitent brotherhoods originally instigated by the Franciscans and the brotherhood of knightly service connected with the Dominicans shows itself in the fact, that, in the Tertiary Rule of Munione, and likewise in that of Nicholas IV., the carrying of offensive weapons, which is otherwise forbidden to the Tertiaries, is allowed in regard to the defence of the Church.

5. The Work and Conflicts of the Mendicant Friars.

As a matter of fact the appearance on the scene of the begging friars indicates a new step in the advance of the ecclesiastical-ascetic forces into the life of the Christian people. The impression that Christianity treats personal holiness as a serious matter gains ground, and the creation of the Tertiaries is the result.

1. The **popular preaching** of the begging friars finds new means of awakening religion. Among the multitude of forces of this sort which went forth among the people individual men of greater importance stand pre-eminent.

As ANTONY of Padua, the friend of S. Francis, worked for several years in southern France as an ardent popular preacher, so from 1250 the incomparable German popular preacher, the Minorite friar BERTHOLD of Regensburg († 1272) exercised his deep-reaching influence by means of his sermons delivered before great crowds of the people in Germany, Switzerland, and also Bohemia and Hungary, quite in the spirit of mediæval Christianity, but on its best side, opposing all false contentment with customary ecclesiastical functions, pressing the essentiality of true repentance of heart and life (B. v. R., *deutsche Predigten*, edited by Pfeifer, 1862, and J. Strobl, 1882; cf. SCHÖNBACH in Steinmeyer's *Anzeiger*, 1881. The **Latin** sermons, edited by Hoetzel, München 1882, are regarded as the more artistic models of the German. *Vid.* JACOB, *die lat. Reden des sel. Bruders Berthold*, Regensburg 1880). The Dominicans also met the necessity of the age. HUMBERTUS de Romanis (*de eruditione prædicatorum*, B. Patr. Lugd. XXV.) regards preaching as more important for the people than the mass, and the great theologian THOMAS AQUINAS does not disdain to preach in a practical manner to the people in Italian.

2. In religious poetry also the Franciscans strike new chords.

The strongly affecting sequence *Dies iræ, Dies illa* is ascribed, if not with entire certainty, to THOMAS CELANO, the biographer of S. Francis. JACOPO DE BENEDETTI of Todi in Umbria seized men's minds by numerous poems composed in the Italian language, which was just then beginning to form itself from the popular dialects; hymns of repentance, spiritual love-songs of melting warmth, satires full of holy wrath, instructions in the following of Christ. Driven from the midst of the excitement of secular life to renunciation of the world by the sudden death of his young wife, he gave his property to the poor and challenged the contempt of the world in an eccentric fashion among the Tertiaries of S. Francis. After ten years, he sought admission into the Order proper in 1278 and overcame the scruples against his admission by the production of a treatise on the contempt of the world. In his intoxicated love of Jesus and his touching distress "that love is not loved," he recalls S. Francis, but at the same time his wrath against the secularization of the Church and the Papacy takes another direction by participating in the league of Roman magnates which aimed at the deposition of Boniface VIII. For this he had to atone in prison till his death (1306). The touching Latin sequence *Stabat mater dolorosa*, which is parallel to and contrasted with the devout *Stabat mater speciosa*, has also been traced back to him (OZANAM, *les poètes francisc. en Italie*, Paris 1852, in German by JULIUS, Münster 1853; E. BÖHMER, *romanische Studien*, Strassburg, I. 123).

3. The most deep-reaching influence of the begging friars consisted in their **care for the souls** of the people. Gregory IX. in 1237 already urgently recommended the Minorites to the prelates of the Church with a view to their receiving permission to preach and **hear confession**. At the same time the Dominicans (Friars Preachers) received the right of preaching and hearing confession everywhere. Especially on Romance soil the Franciscans became the intimate friends and spiritual advisers of the people, and both orders became the most important instruments of the popes in the exertion of ecclesiastical moral influence upon the people in the conflict with the heretics, especially in the Inquisition (*vid. supra*). But the great favour which they received from the popes, and the unexampled success of the quickly spreading orders, which at first enjoyed great popularity, soon brought about a strong reaction, especially when these humble servants of the Church, speedily spoiled by their extraordinary ecclesiastical privileges, interfered everywhere to the disturbance of the regular episcopal and parochial work. A growing animosity to these intruders who snatched everything to themselves took possession of the episcopal clergy.¹ A prophecy which is spuriously imputed to S. Hildegard lashes their fawning pursuit of gifts, their envy of others and their continual hunt for popularity, and complains that they draw away the congregations from their regular pastors and deprive the poor and wretched of their alms. As early as the middle of the thirteenth century the English chronicler Matthew Paris sighs over the oppressive preponderance of the spiritual advisers, without whom many no longer believe that they can be saved, and the sharp contrast of their heaped-up riches with the fundamental principle of their Order, their snatching at privileges, their intrusion into the council of princes and into papal business, and their arrogance towards all other orders. The parochial clergy find themselves injured in authority and revenues by the interference of the friars in the Church's care of souls under favour of the Pope. People of rank prefer to confess to the Preachers, and the populace prefer the Franciscan friars to the parish priest who knows them and whom they know, often in very uncommendable aspects. In 1254 Innocent IV. already sought to set limits to the beggar friars' gaining more ground in the care of souls² and to make their

¹ A witness to the rise of doubtful opinion is already seen in the poem *Disputatio mundi et religionis*, ed. by HAURÉAU in *Bibl. d. l'école de Chartres*, 1884, 3 sqq.

² *Id.* POTTHAST, 15562, also 15359.

preaching and hearing confession in the parochial communities dependent on the permission of the parochial incumbent. If they granted burial places in their churches to their admirers, they were to pay a definite portion of the donations then made to the bishop or parish priest of the place, with several other such regulations. When, soon after this proclamation, Innocent died, it was said that the Franciscans and Dominicans had prayed him to death.¹ His successor Alexander IV. committed himself to the intercession and support of the orders, and immediately cancelled the Bulls of his predecessor.

The ill-will to the spoiled pet-children of the Pope received new nourishment from the fact that the Begging Orders also threw themselves with their whole energy into the pursuit of ecclesiastical science, and very early gained a firm footing in the universities. As early as 1221 the University of Paris gave them room in return for the obligation to hold the exequies for every deceased teacher as for a member of their own Order. The Dominicans made use of the tumultuous conflicts in the University, to obtain by the favour of the bishop and chancellor without the co-operation of the corporation of masters, a *cathedra magistralis in theologia*, and consequently a position in the public life of the university which exceeded the limits of a mere monastic school. In spite of the resistance of the University a second soon followed. The Franciscans followed the example of the Dominicans in despite of the resistance of their General, Johannes Parens, who regarded this as contrary to the original spirit of the Order. Alexander of Hales was the first Minorite to begin to teach, and Innocent IV. commanded the university in 1244 to admit the members of both Orders to academic dignities. The step which was of such enormous consequence for the development of mediæval theology had taken place, in consequence of which nearly all the eminent representatives of scholasticism in the thirteenth century proceeded from these two Orders. The opposition of the university combined with the complaints of the bishops and the parochial clergy against these burdensome intruders. But Alexander IV. took up the claims of the Dominicans and, though the University at first threatened to dissolve, finally carried them through in 1259. WILLIAM OF ST. AMOUR, a teacher of the University of Paris and Doctor of the Sorbonne, published the treatise *De periculis novissimorum temporum*,² which gave strong expression to

¹ Hence the saying: *a litaniis prædicatorum libera nos domine*. *Vid. GIESELER*, II. 2, 535.

² *Vid. E. BROWN, appendix ad fascic. rer. expetend. et fugiend.*, London

the complaints of the dealings of the begging friars. He regards them as the false prophets of the last times (2 Timothy iii. 1; Matt. xxiv. 11), who preach without being regularly sent; their begging without working he regards as robbery of God. A papal commission condemned the book before hearing the delegates of the University, and in spite of the mitigation of his attacks William was forbidden to preach and teach in the University, and he could only venture to return to Paris after Alexander IV.'s death in 1263. He sent a revision of his treatise, which, however, still retained the reproaches against the mendicant orders in a more moderate form, to Pope Clement IV. in 1266. From that time, under the influence of outstanding scholastic representatives of the mendicant orders, the opposition was essentially weakened. The chief ornament of the mendicant orders, Thomas of Aquino, who had to be admitted as doctor of theology in Paris in 1257, and Bonaventura, exerted themselves to overcome the attacks upon the Orders. Thomas justified monks in working publicly as teachers and their entrance into alliance with teachers who were otherwise secular. The authority to preach and hear confession he grounded upon the absolute authority of the Pope and the need of many laymen for theological, educated, monastic confessors. His justification of begging and the rejection of manual labour is rather shifty, and he understands the principle of poverty as only excluding private, but not common, property. Bonaventura too championed the cause of the mendicant orders in a whole series of treatises, but at the same time did not conceal from himself the deeper defects in their life.¹ After the death of Thomas the University of Paris urgently exerted itself to obtain possession of the body of the great theologian. Only a certain limitation of the enormous privileges of the Orders was finally accomplished. Boniface VIII.² limited their rights of preaching and hearing confession in a manner similar to that formerly adopted by Innocent IV. Even these very moderate limitations Benedict XI. had indeed to abolish in 1304, but they were again put in force by Clement VII. in 1311.

The rivalry of the two favoured Orders naturally soon led to angry controversies. As early as 1255, and again in 1278 and

1690, and the edition of the opp. Gulielmi (ed. DE FLAVIGNY) Constantiæ (Paris) 1632, which was suppressed by the exertions of the begging monks, and has therefore become very rare.

¹ *Vid.* the circular to the authorities of the Orders of April 23rd, 1257, in WADDING. *ad ann.* No. 10.

² The Bull "*Super cathedram*" of 1300 in *Extrar. comm.*, III. 6, 2.

frequently, the Generals on both sides had to exhort to peace which, however, in the following century had once more to give place to angry controversies.

6. The internal Conflicts in the Franciscan Order and Joachimism.

Sources and Literature: ENGELHARDT, *Kirchengesch. Abhdlg.* 1833, p. 1 sqq.; U. HAHN, *Gesch. d. Ketzer im MA.* III. 98 sqq.; id., *StKr.* 1849; DÖLLINGER, *d. Weissagungsglaube u. das Prophetenthum in d. christl. Zeit*, Hist. Taschenb. 1871 (shorter writings edited by REUSCH, Stuttg. 1890); RENAN, *Revue des deux mondes* 1864, and id. *Nouvelles études*, 1884; FRIEDERICH in *ZwTh.* 1859; PREGER, *ABAW.* XIII. 3: id., *Gesch. d. Mystik*, I.; H. REUTER, *Gesch. d. Aufkl.*, II. 191; H. HAUPT, *ZKG.* VII.; H. S. DENIFLE, *d. evang. æternum und d. Commission zu Anagni*, *ALKG.* I. 1885; the *chronicon de persecutionibus fratrum minorum* in DÖLLINGER, *Beiträge*, II. 417 sqq. = *historia septem tribulationum ordinis minorum*, by Frater Angelus de Clarino in EHRLICH, *die Spirituellen*, etc. *ALKG.* I. 513; II. 155; 125 sqq.

1. That in the conflicts of the Franciscan parties the popes were not inclined to side decidedly with the strict but ecclesiastically less useful zealots for the poverty and humility of the Order, had already been shown in the conduct of Gregory IX. (p. 407), and likewise in the case of Innocent IV., who, in 1245, in order to settle the laxer practice assigned the right of property in the possessions of the Order to the Roman Church itself, so that the Order might now carry on all necessary affairs of property by means of officials appointed as the commissioners of the Church. But the laxer party of the so-called **Community** (*fratres de communitate*), from which proceeded the successors of Elias of Cortona, the Generals of the order, Haymo of Feversham (1240-43) and Crescentius of Jesi (1244-47), were more and more opposed by the strict enthusiasts for the purity of the Rule as a close party. While under Haymo the Paris teachers decided in the moderate sense of the constitution of Gregory IX. of 1230, the English Province of the Order declared in the strict sense. The deposition of Crescentius as General of the Order seems to have been a result of the action of the enthusiasts, for a representative of the strict principles, JOHN OF PARMA (1247-57), now comes to the front as General. In his time the **apocalyptic temper of Joachimism** was revealed among the strict Franciscans.

2. Ecclesiastical and ascetic piety which took grave offence at the corruptions of the Church and the secularization of the clergy, had even in the twelfth century looked forward prophetically to a renewal and elevation of the Church, and had exalted itself into apocalyptic visions of the future of the kingdom of God. The

celebrated HILDEGARD (born in 1098 or 99), educated by the pious Jutta von Sponheim in the Benedictine nunnery of Disibodenberg, afterwards abbess there, and in 1147 foundress of the monastery on Rupertsberg near Bingen, in her intercourse with the first men of her time raised her voice, which was venerated by popes and potentates, against the corruptions of the Church, proclaimed divine judgments, and after them the victory of the purified Church.

Her ideas, which took the plastic form of sensuous images, were regarded by herself and others as visions, products of the inward divine light (*liber Scivias*). Her letters (in German by K. CLARUS, Augsb. 1854) show the far-reaching influence of the learned and many-sided woman, the *Liber divinorum operum* and the *Liber compositæ medicinæ* her observations of nature (cf. K. Jessen in R. Gottschall's "*Unsere Zeit*" 1881). Opp. Ml. 197, and PITRA, *Anal. sacra*, VIII., Paris 1882. Cf. v. d. LINDE, *die kgl. Landesbibliothek zu Wiesbaden* 1877; SCHMELZEIS in HpB. 1875-76.

The biographer and younger contemporary of Hildegard, the Abbess ELIZABETH of Schönau, who died rather young in 1165, likewise scourged the degeneracy of the Church and took an independent part in the ecclesiastico-political movements. Her visions were accompanied by ecstatic conditions arising from bodily suffering and over-driven nervous life. Her brother, the monk Ecbert (p. 386) gave his assistance in producing her writings (*Visiones* and *Liber viarum Dei*). Her spiritual authority is attested by her share in the rise of the legend of the Eleven Thousand Virgins (p. 331). Opp. Coloniae 1628 and Ml. 197; new edition by F. W. E. ROTH, Brünn 1884.

Of far-reaching influence were the prophetic and apocalyptic studies, arising from similar views, of JOACHIM, abbot in the Cistercian monastery of Corace in Calabria, which were followed with interest by three popes, Lucius III., Urban III. and Clement III. He retired from the Cistercian monastery and with the support of Henry VI. founded a new monastery under a stricter rule, S. Johannis in Fiore, which, confirmed by Cœlestine III. in 1196, became the centre of a special congregation of Cistercians (*Ordo Florentis*).¹ Joachim, who was venerated as a prophetic seer, developed in his writings² his prophetic expectations of the last times and the imminent age of the Holy Spirit, which should lead on from the age of the Father (the law of the Old Testament) and of the son (New Testament, discipline and doctrine of the priesthood and its sacraments) to full spiritual freedom and knowledge, and whose organs the perfected monkhood, contemplative and spiritual men entirely free from the world and its possessions, were to be. The writings

¹ Vid. JANAUSCHECK, *Origines Cisterc.*, I. p. lxxi and 168.

² *Divini vatis I. liber concordia novæ ac. vet. test.*, Venet. 1519; *Expositio Apocal.* Venet. (1519?) 1527; *Psalterium decem chord.* Ven. 1527. *Interpret. in Hieremiam*, Ven. 1525; *Scriptum super Esaiam*. Cf. FRIEDERICH in ZwTh. 1859, 444.

are without any tendency to hostility to the Pope and are written with ready submission to the judgment of the Church, but might easily lead to misconceptions as to the sufficiency and perfection of ecclesiastical Christianity. Before his death (1202) Joachim expressly submitted his writings to the judgment of the Church, which the Fourth Lateran Council recognised, when it declared against him on a subordinate doctrinal question of a scholastic character, and Honorius III. further took him under his protection against attacks on the part of the Cistercians. His prophecies, which expected the possessionless monkhood to bring about the state of perfection, must have been eagerly seized by the genuine Franciscan spirit, which also maintained his apocalyptic ideas and developed them further in writings, especially in a Commentary on Jeremiah and Isaiah, which went under his name and gave a much sharper anti-Roman and anti-ecclesiastical point to his tendency against ecclesiastical corruptions. A treatise by the Franciscan GERARDUS of Borgo San Donnino, *Introductorius in evangelium æternum*, was accused of heretical ideas in 1254 by the Parisian opponents of the Mendicant Orders. The Eternal Gospel prophesied by Joachim (Rev. xiv. 6) *i.e.* the entrance of full spiritual knowledge in the age of the Holy Ghost, Gerard saw embodied in the above-mentioned writings of Joachim himself, as a new revelation. About the year 1200 he said that the spirit of life had been withdrawn from the two Testaments, in order that the Eternal Gospel might arise.

The Parisian opponents collected a series of propositions from the *Introductorius* and Joachim's *Concordia* commented on by Gerard and brought them with an accusation, before Innocent IV. After his death, which took place shortly afterwards, Alexander IV. had them investigated by a commission and compared with the works of Joachim himself. Bishop Florentius of Acre (afterwards Archbishop of Arles) conducted the accusation, and Alexander IV., in spite of his expressed predilection for the Franciscan Order, found himself compelled, in the year 1255, to condemn Gerard's *Introductorius*, though without mentioning the name of Joachim; but in doing so, he commanded that the reputation of the Order itself should be spared and expressly censured the *schedulæ* (the Paris excerpts) which in many cases charged the book erroneously. Gerard, as he would not recant, atoned by life-long imprisonment, in which, after eighteen years, he died. John of Parma, filled with the same spirit of Joachimism, found himself compelled to lay down his dignity as General of the Order, but remained in high esteem among all strict Franciscans. The Synod of Arles in 1263, under Florentius, now

archbishop, repudiated the Joachimite doctrine of the three ages and the writings of the venerated abbot himself. But a general judgment of the Church against them did not ensue. They remained the favourite reading of the strict Franciscans, and their apocalyptic ideas received a more definite form. Joachim himself had already prophesied the beginning of the last times for 1260.¹ The spurious writings explained more definitely. The war of the Hohenstaufen Frederick II. against the papacy was related to it; the Hohenstaufen empire seemed to be destined to be the rod of correction for the corrupt Church, the spiritual Babylon, before it itself should fall a victim to the avenging justice of the Saracens.² The death of Frederick II., however, was insufficient to overthrow these expectations. The decision was at first awaited in 1260; the great flagellant movement of Perugia arose from this disposition of mind.

Penance by scourging, from being a means of discipline for refractory monks had become a favourite means of ascetic self-torture. Under the influence of the Franciscan spirit, common people, impressed by preachers of penance like Antony of Padua, seized upon this drastic method, in view of the nearly approaching last times. But the matter assumed a wider extent in the troops of flagellants of Perugia, which grew as if by contagion.

The constant inward ferment in the Order was at first somewhat repressed by the moderate personal character of Bonaventura, who, however, as the champion of the system of the Order as modified by the papal indulgence, was regarded by the enthusiasts as ambiguous. But the rumour, which emerged in Italy at the time of the General Council of 1274, that Pope Gregory would compel the mendicant orders to accept property, once more raised excitement. At the Provincial Chapter of the Mark of Ancona the resistant enthusiasts were accused as schismatics and in consequence were prosecuted by the community and imprisoned. In consequence of these disturbances the General Chapter of Assisi caused Bonagratia, the General of the Order, to petition the Pope for a revision of the earlier papal declarations as to the Franciscan Rule. Thence originated the Bull of Nicholas III., a former favourer of the Franciscans, "*Exiit qui seminat*" of 1279, which as far as possible met the strict view of the question of poverty, but without entirely excluding the interpretation according to the milder observance. The above imprisoned "**Spirituals**" were freed from severe imprisonment in 1289 by Raymundus Gaufredi, the General of the Order, and

¹ He explained the 42 months or 1260 days of the Apocalypse (chap. xi.) as 42 generations after Christ.

² These apocalyptic expectations assumed a specifically Ghibelline turn in the **Swabian Sect** depicted by Albert von Stade (MGS., XVI. 371). To it Innocent IV. appeared to be Anti-Christ, Frederick II. as the reformer of the Church who should lead back the clergy who had become rich to apostolic poverty (cf. p. 281). Similarly the preaching monk Arnold (*Epistola de correctione ecclesiæ* ed. WINKELMANN, Brl. 1865).

worked in the East, favoured by King Hayton of Armenia, but here too persecuted by their opponents and regarded as apostates. Returning to Italy, they were taken into protection by the pious hermit PETRUS DE MURONE (Celestine V.) who had just been exalted to the Papal chair. He allowed them to live in exact accordance with Francis' original Rule, released them from obedience to their hitherto superiors and assigned them hermitages; they were to live here under the leadership of Liberatus as his (Celestine's) brothers and as poor hermits, but for the sake of peace they were no longer to call themselves *fratres minores*. All the same they were pursued by the hatred of the community, and even the champions of the strict party (Petrus Johannes Olivi, *vid. infra*) disapproved their separation from the Franciscan Order. Boniface VIII. declared all the edicts of his predecessor not expressly confirmed by himself to be null and thus deprived the **Celestinian Hermits** of the legal justification for their society. Liberatus and his followers retired into secrecy, partly to Greece, but here too were persecuted by the bishops and princes in the Frankish domains of Morea and Achaia and finally were excommunicated by the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople. When they returned to Italy after the death of Boniface, King Charles II. of Naples, at the instigation of Gonsalvo the General of the Order, caused them to be prosecuted by the Inquisition and driven from the kingdom. After the death of Liberatus, ANGELUS of Clareno, their now leader, found some protection from Cardinal Napoleon Orsini. He is said to have received permission for them to live together as hitherto from Clement V. in Avignon, where he found shelter in the house of Cardinal Jacob Colonna. But the old conflict was renewed at the Council of Vienne in 1312 and now led to heightened and more general opposition (*vid. the following period*).

The other chief focus of the movement of the Spirituals was Provence, where PETRUS JOHANNES OLIVI, a man of eminence in theology also, was their most esteemed leader. At the time of the negotiations of the Order with Nicholas III., Olivi was still on good terms with the General, Bonagratia, had been in Rome himself, and still later occupied important posts in the Order, *e.g.* as Reading Master in the study of the Order in Florence and afterwards in Montpellier, but had also met with vigorous attacks which at one time led to an examination of his doctrines by Parisian theologians. Behind this controversy, which was chiefly about scholastic questions, there was concealed the opposition of the community of the Order to his strict principles as to the Rule of the Order and the apocalyptic (Joachimite) ideas therewith connected. The general convention of 1285 caused writings of Olivi to be suppressed pending the decision of the new General. The General Chapter of 1287 seems to have decided in his favour; the General, Matthew of Aquasparta, approved Olivi's declaration as to poverty. With his strict principles in regard to the discipline of the order Olivi yet censured the inclination of the Spirituals towards separation and confined himself, on the basis of the position of affairs created by the Bull "Exiit," to combating the strict interpretation of the requirement of poverty, the so-called **usus pauper**, as contrasted with the *usus moderatus* of the majority, but was unable to prevent the Order from ordaining penalties against extreme Spirituals who were regarded as adherents of Olivi. Nevertheless he remained unattacked till the end of his life (March, 1298) and was highly honoured by the clergy and people in the convent at Narbonne. Even King Charles II. of Naples permitted Olivi to be invited to visit his sons, who at that time were residing in Castile as hostages for their father, and General Johannes de Murro, who was regarded as an enemy of the Spirituals, gave the necessary permission with some little reserve. Olivi knew the anxiety of Charles II., lest he might make his sons

sentimental devotees (*inbeguinire*, make them begging friars) and lead them too deep into the foolishness of Christ.¹ In Narbonne, when he had passed away, his memory was celebrated as that of a saint, almost like that of S. Francis. His writings, including the last, *Postilla super Apocalypsi* (written in 1297), were held in very high esteem among the numerous Spirituals of the Provençal groups of the Order. The increasing tension between the parties finally drove Clement V. to serious but vain attempts at reconciliation at Avignon in 1309-1312 and at the Council at Vienne.

The ideas of the Spirituals as to the necessity of leading back the corrupt Church to apostolic poverty were also relied on by GERARD SEGARELLI (Salimbene: Segalellus Gerardinus) in Parma, from 1260 the head of the ecclesiastically revolutionary sect of the **Apostolic Brothers**, who died at the stake in 1300. His adherents, inflamed by the apocalyptic ideas of the priest FRA DOLCINO, were besieged and suppressed in 1307 on Monte Zebello near Vercelli, and Dolcino himself was burned.

¹ Olivi's letter to the princes (ALKG. III. 530-40) shows how deeply Olivi was permeated by the fundamental law of the kingdom of God, that the grain of wheat must die in order to bring forth fruit, and how on this ground, the Minorite renunciation of the world on the one hand and the apocalyptic prospect of the end of all things on the other hand had passed into his flesh and blood.

CHAPTER NINTH.

The Scholasticism of the Thirteenth Century.

Literature: vid. p. 368.

1. The Expanded Resources of Science.

THE dialectical method of treating theology in the twelfth century became general in spite of all contrary tendencies, and gained for itself the recognition of the Church as the support of the Church's faith, although, at the same time, the impression that there was great danger for a faith which rested on this weapon did not disappear. This finds characteristic expression in the legend of SIMON of Tournay, the famous Parisian teacher at the end of the century, who is said to have boasted how much he had done for the doctrine of Jesus by confuting all objections. If he had cared to come forward as an opponent, he said, he could have confuted it with much stronger reasons. At that moment it was said that he suddenly became dumb and deprived of speech. The saying about the three impostors (*vid. sup.* p. 282) was subsequently attributed to him.

About the turn of the century, scholastic theology, by the extension of its scientific horizon and the influence of new philosophical means of culture, passed into a higher stage, whereby it was actually brought to its most flourishing condition, but whereby on the other hand the risk of its breaking up was aggravated. More exact acquaintance with Aristotle and the influence of Arabo-Jewish philosophy here come specially into view.

The philosophy of Aristotle, strongly admixed with Neoplatonic elements from the Greek Church and science, had reached the Arabs and had developed among them a philosophy which at first came into acute discord with the orthodox faith of Islam. The Arabian free-thinkers (Mutazilites) from as early as the eighth century practised unlimited, rationalistic criticism of the positive principles of religion, but were afterwards more repressed by a less radical philosophy. ALFARABI († 950) attempted to place Aristotle, understood in a Neoplatonic (emanational) sense, on a harmonious relationship with the religious requirements of the Koran. AVICENNA (Ibn Sina, † 1073) explained the philosophers in the sense of a religious-mystical supranaturalism, and ALGAZEL († 1111), sceptical of Aristotle, sought a religious support for the religion of Mohammed in the mysticism of Ssufism. There was thus developed a philosophy of religion, which in attachment to the theological exposition of

the Koran, treated the substance of the faith speculatively and critically and discussed questions of principle on the relation of religion and philosophy, speculation and experience, the relation of God to the world, divine determination and human freedom, etc. To this were linked the Arabian philosophers of Spain, Avempaze († 1138), Abubazer († 1185) and especially AVERROËS (Ibn Roschd, † 1198), with the last of whom philosophy appeared as the higher explanation of religion; religion, which is indispensable for the many, gives the highest truths in a pictorial husk, philosophy gives them in the pure notional form.

Of the older Arabian philosophy of the East the Christian Latin West had hitherto only received scanty knowledge in some of its individual representatives.¹ In the middle of the twelfth century Archbishop Raymund of Toledo caused a Spanish Jew, Johannes Hispalensis (Avendeth, Abraham Ibn Daud), to translate works in Arabian philosophy into Castilian, and a cleric, Dominicus Gonzalvi, to translate them into Latin. Since then SAADJA, president of the Jewish Academy at Sura in Babylonia in the tenth century, having plunged into Greek philosophy, there was developed among the Jews also under Arabian influence a similar religious-philosophical speculation. The work of Solomon ben Jehuda ben Gebirol (born in 1020 in Malaga), written in Arabic, exercised an important influence on the Christian Schoolmen, who held it to be the work of AVICEBRON, an Arabian philosopher. The Abraham Ibn Daud who has been mentioned wrought for the blending of Arabian philosophy with Jewish dogma;² so also in a still higher degree did Moses MAIMONIDES (chief work: *Moreh Nebochim*, the Guide of Doubters). It was Jews also who, by commission of Emperor Frederick II., under the guidance of Michael Scotus and Herrmannus Alemannus translated commentaries of Averroës on Aristotle and Aristotelian writings. Soon thereafter the Greek Aristotle became known to a greater extent through Robert Capito, Thomas Cantipratensis and others. Even before the opening up of these purer sources, the Arabian philosophy and a few Pseudo-Aristotelian productions sprung from Neoplatonism, such as the *Theologia* of Aristotle and the book *De causis* which was drawn from Proclus, began their influence on the West. The latter book was already utilized by Alanus ab Insulis.

Persecuted in Saracen Spain, Averroism spread with the charm of a secret doctrine and even found entrance beyond the Pyrenees into Provence and Languedoc.

2. The New Form of the Pursuit of Science: the Universities.

Literature: BULEUS, *Hist. univers. Paris.*, Par. 1655, and in addition JOURDAIN, *Index chronologicus chartarum pertin. ad hist. univ. Paris.*, Paris 1862; H. DENIFLE, *die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*, I., Berl. 1885; G. KAUFMANN, *G. d. deutsch Univ.*, I., Stuttg. 1888.

The seats of the study of theology and the *artes liberales*, out of which dialectics had arisen to such great eminence, had hitherto been partly the cathedral and monastic schools, partly the schools of independent teachers, round whom great masses of pupils often gathered. The great teachers in Paris, Bologna, etc., now sought

¹ GERBERT, the monk CONSTANTINE at Monte Casino (middle of the eleventh century), and ADELARD of Bath.

² *Emunah ramah*, the sublime faith, translated by WEIL, Frankf. a. M. 1852, cf. GUTTMAN, *die Religionsphil.*, etc., 1879.

mutual connexion, corporate formation of the body of scholars and more fixed regulation of the course of teaching. Certain professional departments had already their favourite seats, Medicine in Salerno, Roman and Canon Law in Bologna, Theology in Paris and Oxford. As a civic community was designated *universitas civium*, so an organised scholastic society was designated *universitas scholarium* or *unio magistrorum et scholarium*, so that in many places several *universitates* (= *scholæ*) stood alongside of one another. For the teaching establishment of a locality, regarded as a whole, the name *studium* occurs in the thirteenth century, and indeed, *studium generale*, or *commune*, also *scholæ generales*, a name which is also borne by the great schools of the Dominican Order and which is variously explained. Paris and Bologna became especially important in the development of mediæval university life. Bologna, like many other Italian universities, was a so-called city university, *i.e.* the municipal authority exercised the supervision over the *studium* and legalised the corporate order created by the assembled scholars (teachers and taught). But Frederick I. already gave these Italian universities a privilege which exempted the members of the university from the ordinary municipal jurisdiction, placing the pupils under the jurisdiction of their teachers, but all under that of the bishop.¹

Under other circumstances was founded the University of Paris which was so extraordinarily important in the development of the university system, and which, like Oxford also, arose in closer attachment to ecclesiastical institutions and authorities. The Parisian schools, hitherto independent of one another, including alongside of those of the Cathedral and the Abbey of St. Genovefa those also of individual teachers, for the erection of which the mere permission of the owner of the land on which they arose had been required, began to seek to protect their interests in the corporate association of the teaching masters. Conflicts between the scholars and the citizens occasioned the interference of the King, who placed the scholars for protection under the spiritual jurisdiction exercised by the chancellor of the cathedral foundation. In opposition to

¹ The Privilegium *Authentica habita* in the Corp. jur. civ. ed. KRÜGER-MOMMSEN, II. 511; also MGL., II. 114 and KAUFMANN, I. 165. From a constitution of Justinian's (*Omnem reipublicæ*) Bologna deduced the mistaken assertion that only the *civitates regie*, *i.e.* the cities of imperial foundation, such as it asserted itself to be, were authorised to erect schools of Roman Law. With this assertion it did not prevail against other Italian cities, but it did contribute to the formation of the notion, that a *studium generale* required to be privileged by one of the great powers, the Emperor, the King or the Pope.

this the *communitas scholarium*, i.e. the united association of masters and scholars, sought to assert and extend their self-government. With the co-operation of the papal legate Robert de Courçon there arose the University Statute of 1215, as at that time cases of friction between the chancellor (or rather the bishop) and the university gave frequent occasion for the interference of the Pope to mediate and decide. After the serious tumult of 1221, in consequence of which scholars and teachers left the city, the Bull of Gregory IX. of 1231 (*Parens scientiarum*) established order on the hitherto existing basis.

The corporation was composed of the Masters of Philosophy, who had the right of voting, and the scholars of all the faculties, whose claim to the privileges of the university only rested upon their relation as pupils to individual masters. The faculty of philosophy (arts) is the lower, as the students of the other faculties were obliged first to cultivate the arts for a few years, and in many cases gained the master's degree in philosophy, in which case they were obliged to lecture for some time. In this faculty the conflicts between the older more humanistic and the more modern dialectical tendencies, those as to the authority of Aristotle, on Nominalism and Realism, were fought out, questions which also had a real influence on the tendency and method of theology. Men who possessed academic degrees in the other faculties were, as a rule, Masters of the Faculty of Arts also. The corporate division of the university arose according to nations, of which at first four were enumerated.¹ The legal organization of the four nations, which took place in the third and fourth decades of the century, included the scholars of all faculties and the Masters of Arts. In the general assemblies of the university they exercised the right of voting in seven groups, viz. the four groups of the Masters of Arts of the four nations and the three groups of the Masters of the higher faculties. The Rector as head of the university is only found from 1287. It may be said that the Rector of the scholars of Arts became the Rector of the whole university. At first he stood lower in rank than the presidents of the three higher faculties. But his authority was fortified in conflict with the chancellor. "Besides the Rector we have no other head, except the Pope." The much opposed mendicant friars were of great importance for the most flourishing period of Paris. The Dominican scholars, provided by the order with lodging, food and clothing, were thereby secured against the social wretchedness which elsewhere was so frequent in the world of scholarship. But the foundation of colleges was also intended to promote the same object. Among them, the most famous is that founded by Canon Robert of Sorbonne during the conflict with the mendicant orders and named after him, a society of scholars, who after passing through the curriculum in Arts had to devote themselves to the study of theology. The next most famous is the College of Navarre (also called of Champagne) destined in 1305 for scholars from France and also for beginners and students in Arts. Alongside of such colleges (*Bursæ*) individual masters also kept private schools with board and lodging.

In Oxford, matters were arranged similarly, but with differences on individual points, likewise in attachment to ecclesiastical authorities and spiritual jurisdiction. Masters and scholars lived on benefices, privileges and free places. Here

¹ Gauls, English (afterwards called Germans), Picards and Normans.

also the colleges afforded to the secular clergy a similar support to that which the monks found in their Order. For the rest the Pope interfered much more frequently in Paris than in Oxford, where the king and the city had a stronger share of authority.

3. The Fortunes of Aristotle in Paris; Amalric of Bena and David of Dinant.

Sources: in KRÖNLEIN, *Am. u. Dav. v. D* in StKr. 1847 and in U. HAHN l.c. (p. 382) III. 176 sqq., and PREGER, *G. d. deutsch. Mystik*, I. 467 = DÖLLINGER. II. 400; the decrees of the Synod of Paris of 1209 in MANSI, XXII. 1801 sqq.—*Literature:* PREGER, I. 166 sqq.; 173 and 184; JUNDT, *hist. du panthéisme populaire*; REUTER, l.c. II. 218 sqq.

The higher estimate of Aristotle which was beginning to be felt in Paris was threatened by special dangers in the first years of the thirteenth century. AMALRIC of Bena, teacher first of philosophy and afterwards of theology in Paris, especially prized by the French Crown Prince, subsequently Lewis VIII., excited offence by the assertion that every Christian must believe that he was a member of Christ, besides believing in Christ's birth and death. This was conceived in a pantheistic sense, according to the other utterance attributed to him, that God was all, and there was also attributed to him the proposition that no sin would be accounted to the man who lived in love. This inferred a speculative mystical pantheism, which found salvation in the expanding consciousness of the unity of man with God, for which also the terrors of the law disappear; the life in the spirit is not touched by the life in the flesh. Called to account by Innocent III., Amalric recanted at Paris and died in the peace of the Church soon thereafter. But shortly afterwards numerous adherents of his doctrine were discovered in the bishopric of Paris and the neighbourhood, who, however, bore less the character of a scientific school than that of a sect hostile to the Pope and the Church. A "prophet" announced the incarnation of the Holy Spirit, called down the punishments of heaven on the papacy and prelates as anti-Christian phenomena, and prophesied all the kingdoms of the world to the king of France and his sons. Amalric's doctrine was condemned at the synod of Paris in 1209, the clergy belonging to the sect and the prophet William the Goldsmith were burned, others imprisoned for life.

At the same time the synod also confiscated and burned a treatise (*Quaternuli*) by DAVID OF DINANT, a Parisian teacher, in whose scholastic subtleties Innocent III. had also taken an interest, and who now came under suspicion of pantheism, as his dialectical abstraction so reduced the (Neoplatonic) three principles of God,

νοῦς and *ὑλη* to a substantial unity, that God appeared as the *materia prima*. Further, at the same synod, the study of Aristotle's books on natural philosophy (more accurately of the Arabian Aristotelians) was provisionally prohibited,¹ although before long Johannes Scotus Erigena was rather recognised as a chief source of Amalric's pantheism.

Among Amalric's adherents the pantheistic adaptation of the doctrine of the Church then appeared combined with the idea of the three ages of the world and the hostile disposition towards the Church which were characteristic of Joachimism. The notion of the substantial identity of God and the world leads to the view of a successive revelation of the deity in the periods of the Father, Son and Spirit, in which latter God now daily becomes flesh. Christ is God in the same sense in which every believer may so become, as the Holy Ghost reveals Himself to believers in the consciousness of unity with God. This is the sole real resurrection of the dead, which raises the men of the spirit above mere hope and faith. The Church's faith and sacraments here lose their value. Man has heaven and hell in himself. As Christ put away the law which belonged to the period of the Father, so in the period of the Spirit the ecclesiastical sacraments are abolished.

The above-mentioned prohibition of Aristotle was repeated by Gregory IX. in the Statutes of the University of 1215, but in his Bull to the scholars and teachers of Paris it was designated merely provisional till those books should be purged of the suspicion of heresy. In 1233 the University of Toulouse announced that in it the books forbidden in Paris might be read, and from 1254 they were treated in Paris also as parts of the regular course of study. The commentaries of Alexander of Hales on Aristotle enjoyed papal recommendation, and further attacks were no longer directed against Aristotle but against Averroïsm.

But alongside of Aristotle Platonism as understood in the twelfth century remained a power, not in consequence of more extended knowledge of Platonic writings but under the after effects of the theology of the Fathers and of the Areopagite. The Platonism which William of Auvergne still maintains in hostile opposition to Aristotle is immediately mingled with the influence of Aristotle.

4. The Older great Schoolmen of the Thirteenth Century.

The progress of science reveals itself in a much more comprehensive putting of questions and more methodical treatment of fundamental questions, *e.g.* whether and in what sense theology is a science and entitled to rank along with others. Commentary on the Sentences of the Lombard, for which purpose Aristotle is utilised to the fullest extent, is now formally accompanied by the *summe*

¹ MANSI, XXII. 801 sqq.

(*summa theologica* or *theologiæ*), which indeed are independent dogmatic works, into which the metaphysical conceptions of Aristotle are now also worked. With all their zeal for rational development these men recognise that the mysteries of the Christian faith cannot be convincingly demonstrated by the way of pure reason. The feeling of the limited nature of human knowledge makes itself much more decidedly felt than it had been with Anselm. Hence an effort is made to separate theology more sharply from philosophy. But on the other hand there is an increasing preference for subtleties in which the real interest in the truth of the belief dissolves away in that in pure dialectical problems.

The series of the great schoolmen is opened by ALEXANDER HALESIUS (Halensis, Alesius) who was educated in the English monastery of Hales in Gloucestershire. He studied and taught in Paris, and in 1222 entered the Franciscan Order as *primus Franciscanæ religionis in Parisiensi academia doctor* († 1245).

His *Summa theologiæ universæ* (Venetiis 1745 and frequently), written at the instigation of and approved by Innocent IV., was only completed by his pupils in 1252. He first turns the whole of Aristotle and part of the Arabian commentaries to account for the problem of theology. He places positive and negative propositions alongside of one another (*videtur quod sic et quod non*) and then seeks the decision at the hands of the authorities, not merely those of the Church, Scripture (*veritas*) and the Fathers of the Church (*auctoritas*), but also of Aristotle and classical literature; however, only what is contained in Scripture or can be directly deduced from it is really asserted by him, everything else is only opinion. Among his predecessors, he is pleased to base on the support of HUGO of St. Victor and the LOMBARD. He gained high authority as *theologorum monarcha, doctor irrefragabilis*. His ecclesiastical attitude makes him the chief founder of the doctrine of the *thesaurus supererogationis*.

Alongside of the Franciscan comes his contemporary, the Dominican ALBERTUS MAGNUS, of the family of von Bollstädt, born at Lauingen (in the diocese of Augsburg) in 1193. He studied philosophy in Padua, worked in Cologne and other Dominican convents in Germany, gained the degree of Master of Theology in Paris in 1245, and in 1248 was placed at the head of the chief school of the order formed in Cologne. As Provincial of the Order for Germany from 1254 to 1259 he co-operated at the papal court in the condemnation of William of St. Amour (p. 414), was Bishop of Ratisbon from 1260 to 1262 and then retired to the monastery. Active abroad in many ways, he died on the 15th November, 1280, at a great age.

The erudition of this "*doctor universalis*" includes all the knowledge of his age, though mostly only in the way of compilation. His paraphrased and ex-

planatory reproduction of Aristotle in numerous writings was the means of affording his age more extended knowledge of that philosopher. In the scholastic question of Realism he paved the way for the compromise according to which the universals *ante res* were to be conceived as existing in the divine mind, those *in rebus* as the universal element in individual things, those *post res* as in our thought. With Aristotle, interpreted in the most Christian sense possible, he also combines Platonic and Neoplatonic elements, and in the mystical side of his theology the Areopagite is his guide. This extraordinarily fertile author, besides his writings explanatory of Aristotle, wrote many other philosophical, exegetical and practical theological works, a treatise *De sacramentis* and a *summa de creaturis*, and also furnished a commentary on the Areopagite. His commentary on the Sentences of the Lombard and his *summa theologiæ* are unfinished. Theology is to him a practical science, which is based on the experience of faith conditioned by supernatural revelation, but which does not exclude a process of proof for the sake of agreement among believers and the conversion of unbelievers.—Collected edition, not containing all that is extant in MS., but on the contrary much that is spurious, ed. JAMMY, Lugduni 1651, 21 vols. fo.; SIGHART, *A. M. s. Leben und s. Wissenschaft*, Regensburg 1857.

To this older generation there also belong ROBERT GREATHEAD (Capito, Grosseteste), for a long time Chancellor of the University of Paris, in close alliance with the Franciscans, who died at Lincoln in 1253, and VINCENTIUS BELLOVACENSIS, who died in 1264.

The former along with Michael Scotus was of importance in the translation of the Greek Aristotle, explained Aristotelian writings, but also the theology of the Areopagite, and gained influence on Roger Bacon by his studies in humanism and natural science. But VINCENTIUS BELLOVACENSIS represents the tendency towards encyclopedic compilation of knowledge. He was a Dominican and teacher of the sons of Lewis IX. In the *Speculum quadruplex* (*rationale, doctrinale, historiale* and *morale*) which bears his name, the *speculum morale* is not by himself, but was only subsequently compiled. CHRISTOPH SCHLOSSER, *Vincenz von Beauvais*, 1819. GASS, ZKG., I. 365, II. 332 and 511. W. KRAFFT, *Briefe u. Doc.*, Elbf. 1875, 105.

The culmination of the scholastic theology is indicated by the pupil of Albertus Magnus, THOMAS of Aquino, born 1225 (1227), the son of Count Landulph of Aquino at Roccasecca in the Neapolitan domain. He is said to have been related on his father's side to the house of Hohenstaufen, on the mother's side he was descended from Tancred, Duke of the Normans; Pope Honorius III. was his god-father. His family, deeply involved in the conflicts between the Guelfs and the Ghibellines, wished to retain him in a secular career, but with the support of Pope Innocent IV. he in 1244 carried out his resolution to become a Dominican. He went to Paris in 1245 with Albertus Magnus and there became Bachelor of Theology in 1248. On occasion of a second presence in Paris, along with his friend JOHANNES FIDANZA (Bonaventura) he defeated the mendicant friars in several writings against the university, and

like the friend mentioned became a Doctor of Theology in 1257, which degree included the *potestas docendi ubique terrarum*. Subsequently called to Italy by Urban IV., he taught from 1272 in the University at Naples, formerly founded by Frederick II. and afterwards restored by Charles of Anjou. He died in 1274 on the journey to the Council of Lyons whither he had been summoned by Gregory X. and so before his teacher Albertus, who personally championed in Paris the assailed orthodoxy of Thomas.

Thomas's theology has been designated the most complete accommodation of the Aristotelian philosophy to ecclesiastical orthodoxy. Nevertheless his entire system is pervaded by a carefully concealed discord between the dogma and the philosophical ideas utilised, as also between Aristotelian, Neoplatonic and Areopagitic forms of thought, and it is the last mentioned which always provide the return again to ecclesiastical authority. Although among the ecclesiastical authorities Thomas always assigns a strong preference to the word of Scripture, it is only so as to gain confirmation for ecclesiastical principles; scholastic science pledges itself to champion the entire developed system of the hierarchical Church even on points most remote from the spirit of Scripture. His *Summa totius theologiæ* takes up the subject of ethics to a great extent along with dogmatics, and as in the dogma principles of so-called natural theology are externally linked with those of the revealed, so also the principles of philosophical are linked with those of theological morality. In his *Summa de veritate catholicæ fidei contra gentiles* (heathens, Mohammedans, unbelieving science) the first three books treat of the truths which human reason recognises of itself, the fourth of those which are only known by revelation (edition according to the alleged original MS. by UCCELLI, Rome 1878). In accordance with his view that the end of man, the *vita beata*, transcends the nature of man and is only to be attained by supernatural means, he also forms his justification of the mediæval hierarchical conception of State and Church: *De regimine principum* (only partially proceeding from Thomas). The supernatural nature of the end necessitates a divine government which is incumbent not on the kings but on the priests, to whom the secular rulers must subject themselves.—Works, besides those mentioned: Commentaries on Aristotle and philosophical tractates (e.g. one against Averroës); polemical writings in favour of the mendicant orders (*vid. sup.*), against the Greeks on occasion of the negotiations for union which had been started; scholastic *questiones*, Commentaries on the Lombard, exegetical writings (the compilation entitled *Expositio continua in evangelia*, the so-called *Catena aurea*, Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles and several others); collected edition Rome 1570 sqq. repeated in many forms; the Paris ed. of 1853 sqq. is regarded as the best edition of the *Summa*; K. WERNER, *d. hl. Th. v. A.*, 3 vols., Regensburg 1854-59; RE.² s. v.

The Franciscan BONAVENTURA (John of Fidanza), a friend of Thomas, born in 1221, combines strongly marked Franciscan monastic humility with the effort after scientific culture. The pupil of Alexander Halesius till the latter's death, then of John of Rochelle, from 1253 he was Doctor, and the holder of an independent

chair. Alexander Halesius had said of him, "*in fratre Bonaventura Adamus non peccasse videtur.*" In the year 1256 he became General of his Order under circumstances which compelled him to oppose the extremes of the strict Franciscans and their Joachimism. But even the Franciscan zealots were unable simply to put aside his imposing personality. He influenced the Order in many ways as a reformer, and championed his cause in controversy with William of St. Amour. He rejected the Archbishopric of York offered him by Clement II.; Gregory X., to whose election he is said to have essentially contributed, made him a Cardinal of the Roman Church. He made an impressive speech at the Council of Lyons, but died during its continuance on the 15th July, 1274.

His mystical tendency followed in the steps of Bernard and the Victorines, as also of the Areopagite. Hence he had a predilection for Plato in the traditional sense, and practised polemic against the partially misunderstood Aristotle. At the same time he stands under the influence of the scholastic movement produced by the latter. For him mystical contemplation is exalted above all human science of speculation. His *Itinerarium mentis ad Deum* shows the steps by which the spirit is to raise itself from the contemplation of the visible world as a reflection of the Godhead by dwelling in its own spiritual life until it reaches the *excessus mentalis et mysticus*. Corresponding to this is the exaltation gradually rising from the consciousness of sin and grace to the enjoyment of heavenly joy (*Soliloquium animæ*). Bonaventura also wrote a commentary on the Lombard. The *Centiloquium* is a more popular, the *Breviloquium* a more scientific dogmatic.—Works, Rome 1588-96 and frequently; also ed. by PELTIER, Besançon and Paris 1861 seq.; *Breviloqu.* and *Itiner.*, ed. HEFELE, 3rd ed., Tübingen, 1862. On a new edition, *vid.* P. FIDELIS A FANNA, *Ratio novæ collectionis*, etc., Turin 1874; BERTHEAUMIER, *Gesch. d. hl. Bon.*, etc., Regensburg, 1863; HOLLENBERG, *Studien zu Bon.*, 1862, and StKr., 1868.

HENRY of Gent (Goethals?) (1217-1293) in opposition to the Aristotelianism of Albert and Thomas defended a style of doctrine¹ which was more closely attached to Augustinian Platonism. Alongside of him appear also STEPHEN TEMPIER and others as opponents of Thomism.

ROGER BACON, (1214-94), a Franciscan and pupil of Robert Greathead, pressed essentially beyond the standpoint of Albert and Thomas. He indeed holds much of Aristotle as also of Averroës, but would have the dialectical method supplemented by the study of languages, mathematics and the natural sciences, and in this respect distinguished himself before his time by many startling glimpses of truth. If knowledge is to be gained by *argumentum* as well as by *experientia*, it is only the latter, he says, which leads to indubitable results. But *experientia* is not only outward, through sense, but also

¹ *Vid.* EHRLE, in ALKG., I. 366.

inward and culminates in ecstatic knowledge, and here comes in contact with Averroës' conception of the active understanding.

Opus majus, ed. JEBB, London 1733; *opus minus* and introduction to *opus tertium*, ed. BREWER, London 1859 (Sc. v. Br.); E. CHARLES, *R. v. B., sa vie*, etc., Paris, 1861.

5. Averroïsm.

Literature: REUTER, *G. d. Aufkl.*, II. 148 sqq.

The exertions which were directed towards the defence of the Church's doctrine were accompanied by the tendency whose aim was doubt and the breaking up of ecclesiastical authority. The endeavour after free investigation, in the sense of the new ideas, which was rising in Paris, was combated from 1240 by WILLIAM of AUVERGNE, Bishop and Chancellor of Paris and representative of the more Platonic tendency of the older sort. Moreover as Chancellor, at variance with the University, he rejected twelve propositions (among them two were Averroïst), and threatened their defender with excommunication, which actually and at once, as an interference with the rights of the university, called forth vigorous resistance. Then, when in 1247 the papal legates had deprived a Parisian Master, John BRESCAIN of the authority to teach, on account of certain theological false doctrines discussed in lectures on logic, William demanded that according to the university statute the teachers in Arts should only lecture on philosophy, and that the theologians should only lecture on theology. With the increase of the sceptical current, Bishop Stephen TEMPIER of Paris in 1270 again condemned thirteen heretical propositions and threatened their defenders with excommunication. In order to avoid conflicts of this character the philosophical faculty itself now resolved that no Master of Philosophy should discuss purely theological questions (the Trinity, Incarnation, etc.), and also that mixed questions should not be discussed in such a way as that they should be decided in contradiction of the Church's faith. In accordance with the command of John XXI., the Bishop of Paris in 1277 again caused a great number of propositions, regarded as heretical or suspicious, to be set forth, in doing which, however, various party influences made themselves felt. Alongside of the Averroïst propositions there appear here a few with which the Franciscans reproached Thomas Aquinas. But, in the Rescript of Bishop Stephen, the doctrine, according to which something might be true in theology and false in philosophy, and vice versa, was now rejected. In the sense of the Averroïst free-thinkers this only expressed under a thin veil the

irrationality of the Church's faith; others saw in it the imagined possibility of a book-keeping by double entry in one and the same personality, at once believing and knowing; while others still, thereby justified their submission to the authority of the Church, appealing to the unsearchable nature of the mysteries of the faith.

6. Raymond Lull.

Sources: R. L. opp., *quæ ad artem universalem pertinent*, Strassb. 1598, 1654; an uncompleted and very rare collected edition by J. SALZINGER, Mainz 1721-42. *Obras rimadas*, Palma 1859.—*Literature*: besides WADDING J. N. ANTONIO, *biblioth. hispan. vetus*, II., Madrid 1798; HELFERICH. R. L. und die Anfänge *catalonischer Literatur*, Berl. 1858. NEANDER, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, II. 1846. REUTER l.c. II. 95. ERDMANN, *G. d. Ph.*, I. 377.

While William of Auvergne, with all his apologetic exertions for the doctrine of the Church, still threatened in the end to overthrow his opponents by the authority of the Church and the Inquisition, Raymond believed that he possessed a method of rational and at the same time universally enlightening conversion to the faith and of uniting all religious parties.

DON RAMON LULL, born in Majorca in 1234, was rich, lived as a knight and man of the world, cultivating song and the service of love at the court of James the Conqueror in Aragon, till he suddenly retired as a hermit on a mountain in Majorca, and, seized by missionary ideas, learned Arabic from a Moorish slave, and in 1276 founded a college of Franciscans on his island, who learned Arabic and Chaldee, and were intended to carry on missions in Africa and the East. He sought to win the Pope and the kings of France and Aragon for this purpose. He himself disputed in Tunis with Saracen scholars, then exerted himself vainly in the East to win the schismatical Patriarch of the Nestorians, combated the Averroists again in Africa, and finally at the Council at Vienne (1311) effected the foundation of chairs of the Oriental languages (in Paris, Oxford, and Salamanca). His third missionary journey ended with his being stoned (June, 1315) in North Africa, in consequence of which, having been taken on board by Christian mariners, he died on the way home. Burning missionary zeal, nourished by the glow of devoted love of God, is combined in him with a perfectly rational method, on which he placed great hopes. His *Ars magna* is an attempt to establish every possible definition of ideas by means of a mechanical schematism for the purpose of solving scientific problems. His highest postulate is the inseparability of faith and

knowledge; nothing can be an object of belief which the understanding recognises as contradictory of itself or of the idea of the divine perfection. But faith soars ahead of the understanding, the labouring intellect follows. Man's power of knowledge is trammelled by the limit of corporeality, disturbed by sin, yet convincing grounds of self-reflective reason are able to overcome false belief and prove every article of the faith. The old confidence of an Anselm or an Alanus ab Insulis appears here once more. Practical views, even reforming notions on ecclesiastical life, a powerful sense of the revelation of God in nature and human life (*Liber de miraculis cœli et mundi*, a religious *orbis pictus*) and edificatory treatises and poems exhibit the religious vitality and moral earnestness of the man. A religious romance called "*Blanchier*" makes its hero begin as a hermit and monk, and ascend through all the grades of the hierarchy, and finally end again as a recluse in mystical union with God and seraphic ardour of love. For, with all his reforming traits, his ideal remains within the bounds of the asceticism of the Church. The Church hesitated whether it ought to reckon him among the saints or the heretics.

7. Johannes Duns Scotus.

In the strongest contrast to such naïve confidence in the demonstrability of the faith appears his contemporary, the great scholastic chief of the Franciscans. SCOTUS, born at Dunston in Northumberland, worked in Oxford, from 1304 in Paris, in 1308 in Cologne, where in this year he died, still young. He already indicates the transition to the dissolution of Scholasticism proper. He seeks to maintain the menial attitude of philosophy towards theology. Along with sceptical criticism of arguments, strict belief in the doctrines of the Church and the philosophic doctrines which correspond to their spirit is to be maintained. His far-reaching doubts of the demonstrability of the truths of the faith would not champion the doctrine of twofold truths in the sense of the radical Averroists, or abolish the domain of rational natural theology, which only requires to be supplemented by revelation, but would only limit it much more than Thomas. Nor does he by any means disdain the support of rational grounds, although he denies them mathematical stringency. But as he does not interpret Aristotle in a Christian sense like Albert and Thomas, but explains him in a naturalistic and determinist sense, and denies a speculative theology, he prepares the way for a breach between natural worldly knowledge and Christian believing thought, though in the sense that the

truths which are unattainable to the theoretical reason are to be revealed for the practical reason in attachment to the authority of the Church.

JOH. DUNSI SCOTI, *opp. omnia*, etc., Lugd. 1639, 12 vols., including the *Opus Oxoniense*, vols. 5-10, the *Reportata Paris.*, the so-called *Opus Paris.*, vol. 11 (=ed H. CAVELLUS, Col. 1635); E. EL. ALBERGONI, *resolutio doctr. Scoticæ*, Lugd. 1643.

CHAPTER TENTH.

The Ascetic and Mystical Piety of the Thirteenth Century.

Sources: FR. PFEIFFER, *deutsche Mystiker des 14 Jh.*, I., Lpz. 1843, in the appendix. B. FRATRIS DAVID DE AUG., *pia et devota opusc.*, Aug. Vind. 1596, also in B.P. Lugd. XXV.; P. GALL MOREL, *Offenbarungen der Schwester Mechthilde*, Rgsb. 1689; *Revelationes Gertrudianæ et Mechthildianæ*, ed. BENED. SOLESMENS., Poitiers and Par. 1875-77.—Literature: on S. Elizabeth: K. W. JUSTI, 2nd ed. 1835; WEGELE in HZ., V. 751; E. Ranke in ADB.; G. Börner in NA., XIII.; W. PREGER, *G. d. dtsh. Mystik*, I., 1874.

SPIRITUAL life having been augmented on all sides, and having at the same time become more open in individual cases, personal piety of an ascetic and mystical character as cultivated by monasticism, especially by the mendicant friars, undergoes an important enhancement and is at the same time spread beyond the narrowest circle of the monastic life proper, among the Tertiaries and Beguines, and even among the secular classes, especially among women of rank. In the case of the Hungarian princess, S. ELIZABETH, wife of the Landgrave Lewis IV. of Thuringia, the mystical element in her self-less and humble piety receded in favour of the ascetic element, self-chastisement and absolute, though thoroughly voluntary, submission to the guidance of her conscience by her severe confessor, Conrad of Marburg (p. 401). But the positive complement of her character consisted in the practice of mercy, insatiably intent on the service of the miserable. Renunciation of the world led others from the secular life into the cloister, *e.g.*, S. HEDWIG, or in more ancient fashion into anchoritism, *e.g.*, the admired forest-sister, JUTTA von Sangerhausen, whose aim it was to exert a converting influence on the heathen Prussians by the impression made by her life.

But the richly developed emotional life turns towards the mystical experiences of the inner man. The Franciscan friar, DAVID of Augsburg († 1272), in his German writings brought the treasures of pious theology near to the German heart, *e.g.* in a free redaction of Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*, but at the same time in his Latin writings he cultivated the mystical life in the sense of Bernard and

the Victorines, and also of Albertus Magnus, and developed the psychological degrees of inward absorption, the distinction between the *vita activa* and *contemplativa*, and the nature of the ecstatic condition. In the midst of the advance of secular life and secular interests, and the enhanced arts of scholastic theology and the hierarchical Church, the mystical cherishing of the inner man which the world despised, ridiculed, or suspected as heretical, won many adherents in the German Netherlands, Upper Germany and Thuringia, especially in nunneries and among the Beguines, partly under the care of pious monks, especially Dominicans. Visions and states of ecstasy form the culmination, often under morbid feminine conditions, of a religious life of feeling and phantasy passing through abrupt contrasts of mood, which indeed, having its root in the older mysticism of the Church, issues in experiences of bridal love of Jesus of great tenderness and cordiality, but often also of strong sensuous ardour.

The noble born MECHTHILD of Magdeburg, lived for thirty years as a Beguine, concealed in Magdeburg, and afterwards from 1265 onwards in the Cistercian nunnery of Helfta near Eisleben, under the Abbess Gertrude von Hackeborn. The apocalyptic ideas in her revelations (the flowing light of the Deity) recall Joachim. She expects the renewal of the Church from the preachers of the last times (as it were idealized Dominicans). She regarded S. Elizabeth, Saints Francis, Dominic and others, and the forest-sister Jutta as forerunners of the renewal in the different ranks. Flight from the vanity of the world and divine yearning after love lead through forsakenness to the joy of the bridal union with Jesus. All question of law disappears in the irresistible power of yearning love which says: "I have driven the Almighty God from heaven, how wouldst thou, vile worm, be healed." The only thing is so to love again Him who has died for love of man, that one would die for His sake. "Then burnest thou for ever unextinguished as a living spark in the fire of living majesty." Her revelations, originally written in Low German, were arranged and translated into Latin by her godfather, the preaching friars, HENRY of Halle. Subsequently (about 1143) Henry of Nordlingen translated the Low German text into High German.

Her name-sake, MECHTHILD VON HACKEBORN, a younger sister of the Abbess, stood under her influence in Helfta. Two of her friends wrote down her revelations as the "Book of Spiritual Grace" (*Liber spiritualis gratie*, or *Speculum sp. gr.*, Lpzg. 1510, and in the *revelationes* mentioned). Under severe bodily suffering there here arose ecstatic conditions in which, while the body is confined and torpid, the soul lies in God's "employment," swims in the Deity, like a fish in water, and "there is no difference between the union, in which the saints enjoy God's perfection, and that of my soul, except that they are in joy and I in outward pain." To the same cloister at the close of the thirteenth century belonged the NUN GERTRUDE (the Great Gertrude), in whose *Insinuationes divine pietatis*, along with all their morbid phenomena and a certain mystical extravagance which naïvely and boldly treats on equal terms with God the Lord of all things, there is exhibited a healthy kernel of religion and morality. She accepts the Lord's call: "I will make thee blessed and free

with the stream of My divine joy" as a pure vocation to grace and allows herself to be led from the narrow limits of legalism to cheerful confidence in salvation, in which even the consciousness of her own sins can no longer perplex her.

German poetry also now attests the pervasive influence of lively pious sentiments of a mystical tinge. The tractate **Filia Sion**, written in Latin, depicts in mystico-allegorical style the way of the soul, seeking God, through love and prayer to God. Love wounds with its arrow the heart of the heavenly King, till the soul receives the beloved with intuitive feeling and ends with exultation and vows of eternal fidelity. This material was put into poetic form even before the end of the thirteenth century, more broadly and trivially by the Minorite LAMPRECHT of Ratisbon (ed. by WEINHOLD, Paderborn 1880), with greater perfection of proportion and form in the *Buochlin von der Tochter Syon*, ed. by O. SCHADE, Berlin 1849.

CHAPTER ELEVENTH.

The Greek Church.

Sources : NICEPHORUS BRYENNIUS (cf. J. SEGER, *byzant. Historiker des 10. u. 11. Jh.*, I., München 1888), Bonn 1836; ANNA KOMNENA, *Alexias*, REIFFERSCHEID, Lpzg. 1811; JOH. ZONARAS, ed. DINDORF, 1868-1875; JOH. KINAMOS, Bonn 1836. For the whole twelfth century NIKETAS AKOMINATUS (Choniates), Bonn 1835; GEORGIUS AKROPOLITA (ambassador at the Council of Lyons in 1274), *Chronicon*, Bonn 1837; GEORGIUS PACHYMERES, Bonn 1835, for 1258-1308; LEO ALLATIUS, *Græciæ orthodoxæ scriptores*, Rome 1632 and 1639; id., p. 222; H. LEMMER, *Scriptor. Græciæ orthodoxæ biblioth. selecta*, I. 1-6, Friburgæ 1864-65; ANDREAS DEMETRAKOPULOS, *Biblioth. eccles. cont. Græc. theolog. opera*, I. Lipsiæ, 1866.—*Literature*: FINLAY, *Hist. of the Byzant. and Greek Empire* (1057-1453), London 1854; HOFF's article in ERSCH and GRUBER, vol. 85; GFRÖRER, *byzant. Geschichten*, ed. WEISS, Gratz 1872 and 74; BIKELAS, *the Greeks of the MA.*, translated by WAGNER, Gütersloh 1874.

1. The Internal Circumstances of the Greek Church.

THE dynasty of the Comnenæ, which begins with Isaac in 1057 but only confirms its hold after an interruption lasting almost twenty years caused by changing pretenders to the crown, produced important rulers in Alexius I. (1080-1118), Johannes (Kalo-J.), and Manuel (—1180), who had to combat serious disturbances (the advance of the Seljuks in Asia Minor, conflicts with the Normans, the rise of the new Bulgarian kingdom, oppression by the Patzinaks and other northern tribes). Then followed the inundation of the Crusaders, the disturbances which led to the establishment of the Latin Empire and finally the regaining of the Greek Empire by Michael Paleologus.

The spirit of the Greek Church is expressed on the one hand in the forms of the Byzantine Cæsaro-papism, and the entanglement of the higher clergy in court-intrigues and marked servility, on the other hand in the continuation of learned occupation with classical as well as ecclesiastical literature. The career of the learned MICHAEL PSELLUS (p. 235) extends into the beginning of this period. He treated, in poetical form, biblical, moral, and ecclesiastico-legal matters, and also Greek mythological subjects, and his writings extended by way of compilation to all sorts of secular studies (Mgr.

122). One of his pupils was JOHANNES XIPHILINUS, to whose extracts from Dio Cassius we owe the knowledge of lost books by that author. Scholastic treatment of the Aristotelian philosophy is exhibited by EUSTRATIUS of Nicæa (beginning of the twelfth century). EUSTATHIUS of Thessalonica is at the same time the most prized commentator on Homer and Dionysius Periegetes. Along with Constantinople, Thessalonica and Athens gain importance as schools of classical study. The Princess ANNA COMNENA treats historical matter in poetical form.

In the theological field NICETAS SERONIUS, Metropolitan of Heraclea about 1070 supplies exegetical catenæ. The commentaries of THEOPHYLACT (Archbishop of Achrida in Bulgaria, † 1107), which are drawn specially from Chrysostom, pursue the path opened up by Œcumenius (p. 235, Mgr., 123-126). EUTHYMIUS ZYGADENUS († 1118) in his commentaries made use of many ancient exegetes otherwise lost to us; edited by Nik. Kalogeras, Athens 1887. The *Panoplia dogmatica* of Euthymius (p. 241) only has historical value where he speaks of sects of his own time (*Opp.* Mgr., 128-134). Of a similar spirit is NICETAS ACOMINATUS, *Thesaurus orthodoxias* (Mgr., 139, 140). To the older collections of Photius (*Nomokanon*, p. 235), JOHANNES ZONARAS and THEODORE BALSAMON about 1170 supplied commentaries on ecclesiastical law which were much utilized.

Numerous dogmatic controversies of a subordinate character rarely allow the recognition of a deeper real interest lying behind the zeal for correct dogmatic formulas. EUSTRATIUS of Nicæa, mentioned above, in his zeal against Monophysitism was led to assertions which he had to withdraw as Nestorian.¹ SOTERICHOUS PANTEUGENOS combated the sentence from the Greek liturgy of the Supper: "σὺ εἶ ὁ προσφέρων καὶ προσφερόμενος καὶ προσδεχόμενος, χρίστε, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν," because the atoning sacrifice for men could not concern the whole Trinity, but the Father only, unless they were to fall into Nestorian separation of the natures. But for this reason at the Synod of Constantinople in 1156, with the vigorous participation of the Emperor Manuel, he was declared unworthy of the rank of Patriarch of Antioch.² Ten years later there was an eager dispute over the saying John xiv. 28: "the Father is greater than I," and the Emperor Manuel decided that it was to be referred to the divine as well as the human nature, and punished the opposing Archbishop George of Nicæa with suspension for a year. NICHOLAS of Methone, who took part in many controversies of this sort,

¹ DEMETRAKOPULOS, l.c., p. ιά—ις.

² MAI, *Spicil. Rom.*, X. 1; DRÄSEKE in *ZwTh.*, 1884.

instigated by Soterichos, in his two orations on the sacrifice of the Supper grasped the idea of the innumerable priestly acts of the sacrifice of the Mass as the sensuously separate phenomena of the one eternal sacrifice and sought to demonstrate the necessity of Christ's atoning death, not like Anselm from juridical points of view, but entirely on ancient Greek grounds.¹

EUSTATHIUS, monk and deacon in Constantinople, afterwards Archbishop of **Thessalonica**, who survived and himself described the devastation of Thessalonica by the Normans in 1185, and died about or after 1194, is distinguished by the practical reforming tendency of his strong character and personality; *Opp.*, Mgr., 135-136. ULLMANN, l.c., and NEANDER, *wissensch. Abhandl.*, ed. Jacobi, 1851.

The enthusiasm for classical literature leads in opposition to the dry ecclesiastical dogmatics to paganizing tendencies, after-effects of Neoplatonism, by which Nicholas of Methone was induced to controvert Proclus.² To others all effort after scientific knowledge seemed perilous to the faith. The "Gnosimachs" preferred to remain in their simplicity, as God did not require science but only good works. The ecclesiastical dogmatism and mechanism found a certain counterpoise in the mystical contemplativeness which was in close touch with the disposition of the Euchites (Bogomiles), as was shown by CONSTANTINE CHRYSOMALOS (p. 242).³

The **Monks**, as the real representatives of Greek popular piety, more and more obtained the almost exclusive exercise of the ecclesiastical discipline of confession and penance; but under similar conditions to those in the West the class became secularised and deteriorated, as is shown by Eustathius of Thessalonica.⁴ The emperors sought to set limits to the great increase of riches among them. Manuel forbade landed property to be given to new monasteries which were to be founded; the necessary sustenance was to be provided out of the imperial treasury, the revenues of great monasteries were to be administered by secular officials. But circumstances similar to those which obtained at one time in the Frankish Empire, also led to the bestowal of monasteries, church-hospitals and the like on laymen of rank as beneficiaries (*χαριστικάριοι*), which took place to the widest extent under Alexius I.

¹ NIKOLAI METH., *orationes duo*, ed. DEMETRAKOPULOS, Lips. 1865, and id. l.c., p. 199-380; cf. ULLMANN in StKr., 1833; Möller in JdTh., 1867, 359 sqq.; DRÄSKE in ZKG. IX.

² *Ἀνάπτυξις τῆς θεολογικῆς στοιχειώσεως Πρόκλου*, ed., VOEMEL, Frkf. 1825.

³ On the monk Nippon, *vid.* NEANDER, *K.G.*, V. 2, 1102.

⁴ Eust. *Examination of the monastic class*, translated by TAFEL, Berl. 1847.

and obtained formal recognition by ecclesiastical law. The corrupting consequences for monastic discipline were depicted and bewailed by Johannes Antiochenus (*Oratio de disciplina monastica*, Mgr. 132, 1117 sq.). The spirit of the better monasticism was shown under Alexius by JOHANNES NESTEUTES,¹ by the restoration of the monks to a **life of real poverty** on the one hand and to works of mercy on the other. The greatly increased settlements of monks on Mount Athos (p. 232) fostered contemplation and philosophy in the traditional fashion.

Alongside of regular monasticism the eccentric forms of the old Oriental anchoritism and asceticism continued to spread—the tree, pillar and cave saints, who tried to gain authority and privilege by their peculiarities and made the most of popular superstition by their deceptive arts. Ecstatic phenomena such as those presented by the Hicetae of the twelfth century who performed choric dances with like-minded nuns in their monasteries, recall older phenomena and were combated as heretical.

2. The Relations of the Greek Church to the West.

Literature: vid. p. 222, and RATTINGER in JGG., I. 77 and II.

After the schism of 1054 (p. 230) attempts at bringing the two churches together were always being renewed. The emperors Michael VII. and Alexius II. looked for the help of the West against the Saracens, but the Crusades little corresponded to their wishes. The Latins founded Latin dominions in the East and instituted Latin patriarchs and bishops. Lower Italy was withdrawn from the Byzantines by the Normans, and the Greek bishops there were shortly replaced by Romans (synod of 1096 under king Roger). At the synod at Bari in Apulia, Anselm of Canterbury, who was then in Italy, renewed the old attempts to win the Greeks to attachment to Latin doctrine and rites. In all the negotiations for a settlement in the twelfth century the dogmatic difference in regard to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is perpetually discussed. Archbishop Petrus Chrysolanus of Milan, who was sent by Pope Paschal to Alexius in 1113, was encountered by Eustratius of Nicæa, Johannes Phurnes and others.² So likewise under John Comnenus, Archbishop Nicetas of Nicomedia opposed the Premonstratensian Anselm (afterwards Bishop of Havelberg), sent by the Emperor Lothar. But nothing beyond wishes for the settlement of the con-

¹ Vid. GELZER in ZwTh., 1884, 59 sqq.

² DEMETRAKOPULOS, l.c., 84-99 and 18-36.

troversy was attained.¹ Manuel's exertions (Synod of Constantinople in 1170) remained without result. The Latin acts of violence in the East, such as the destruction of Thessalonica by the Normans and the acquisition of Cyprus by Richard Cœur de Lion, in consequence of which the Greek clergy there were cruelly persecuted, finally, the conquest of Constantinople and the establishment of the Latin empire heightened the opposition. Innocent III. utilized the emancipation of Bulgaria from Byzantium, in 1186, to reassert under King JOANNISA (1197-1207) the old ecclesiastical claims of Nicholas I. Tirnova became the seat of a Bulgarian Patriarch appointed by Innocent. So likewise Innocent immediately took in hand the ecclesiastical organization of the Latin empire; but the fall of the Latin empire again destroyed the new state of affairs for the most part here and in Bulgaria.

In spite of the deep-rooted embitterment on both sides, circumstances drove the rulers of the Greek empire of **Nicæa** again to attempt to secure the good will of the Pope for the reacquisition of their lost domains. Johannes II. Ducas Vatazes and his patriarch Germanus again negotiated through Dominicans and Franciscans with Gregory IX. in 1234 at Nicæa, and again without success in the fifth decade. BLEMIDES, a pious monk and priest, showed inclination to a dogmatic compromise, but was unable to carry it out in the negotiations of 1245, because he had fallen into disgrace with the Emperor for subjecting his mistress Markesina to an act of ecclesiastical discipline. But in altered circumstances his writings addressed to Theodorus Laskaris II. (1254-58) acquired influence. MICHAEL PALÆOLOGUS, who with the help of the Genoese in 1261 put an end to the already greatly diminished Latin Empire in Constantinople, for the sake of securing his position sought union with Pope Urban IV., and silenced the opposition of his clergy to the union which he conceived as merely feigned. GREGORY X. pursued the work of union and caused western theologians to sketch opinions for the impending Council of Lyons. In Constantinople the Patriarch Joseph compelled his keeper of the archives BEKKOS to declare sharply against the heresy of the Latins. But the Emperor took Bekkos prisoner and actually converted him, as it appears, by the help of the writings of Nicholas Blemmides. The Patriarch Joseph returned and the Greek ambassadors at Lyons had to sing the offensive *filioque* in the Creed along with the Latins. Gregory demanded the acceptance of the Romish confession, though in such fashion that the form of the Greek symbol should remain in use unaltered, and

¹ Anselm's report to Eugenius III. in *MI.* 188, 1139 sqq.

on condition of the union he assented to the subjection of the Bulgarian and Servian Church to the see of Achrida. The point of similarity of form in the ritual with the Latin Church was not pressed. Bekkos, now Patriarch, was however unable to silence by his defensive writings the opposition of the Greeks to the union which the Emperor relentlessly carried out. As the political results of the union which the Emperor expected did not ensue, he became lukewarm in the business, and Rome recognised that the whole affair had been mere Greek jugglery. In 1281 Pope Martin uttered the ban against Michael, and the latter, after his death in 1282, could not even be buried with the usual ecclesiastical pageantry on account of the state of popular feeling. Bekkos abdicated, and died in exile.

FOURTH PERIOD.

The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.

CHAPTER FIRST.

The Age of the French Papacy.

Sources: ALBERTINUS MUSSATUS, *Historia Augusta s. de actis Henrici VII.* and its continuations in BÖHMER's *Fontes rer. Germ.* I. 370; GIOVANNI VILLANI, *Historie Fiorentine* with the continuations by his brother Matteo and his son Filippo, ed. by MOUTIER, Flor. 1823-26, by GHERARDI DRAGOMANNI, Flor. 1844; JO. VITODURANI (v. Winterthur) *Chronicon* (down to 1348) in ECCARD, *Corp. script. med. ævi* I., also in the *Thesaurus hist. Helv.*, Tig. 1735; M. ALBERTI Argentinensis *Chronicon* (down to 1378) in URSTISH *Germ. histor.* II.; CLOSENER's *Strassb. Chronicle* (down to 1362) in BLV., I., Stuttg. 1843; GOBELINUS PERSONA, *Cosmodromium* in MEIBOMII *repr. Germ.*, t. I. 53 (of independent value from 1347 onwards): (DINO CAMPAGNI, *istoria Fiorent.* has been proved a forgery by SCHEFFER-BOICHORST, *Florent. Studien*, Lpz. 1874, *über die Chronik des Dino Camp.*, Lpz. 1875).—*Literature*: TH. LINDNER, *G. d. dtsh. Reichs vom Ende des 14. Jh. bis zur Ref.* I., 1 and 2, Braunsch. 1875-80; id. *Deutsche Gesch. unter den Habsburgern u. Luxemb.* I., Stuttg. 1890.

1. The Papacy at Avignon.

Sources and Literature: ST. BALUZII *vita Paparum Avenion.*, Par. 1693 and '94; C. v. HÖFLER, *die avignon. Päpste* in the Almanac of the *Akad. d. W.*, Jhrg. 21, Wien 1871; L. PASTOR, *G. d. Päpste im ZA. der Renaissance* I., Freib. 1886; J. F. ANDRÉ, *Étude sur le 14 s.*, Avignon 1888.

THE successor of Boniface VIII., the former Dominican General BENEDICT XI. (1303-4), had been obliged to abolish or at least practically allow to drop all resolutions of his predecessor which were detrimental to France. After his sudden death and a nine months' vacancy the French party in the Conclave gained the victory and elevated the Gascon Bertrand de Got (d'Agoust) as CLEMENT V. (1305-1314). He, being greatly dependent on Philip, remained in France, and after some years established his residence in Avignon, repeated the absolution of the King which had been pronounced by his predecessor, admitted the two Colonnas again into the College of Cardinals, withdrew the Bull *Clericis laicos* in 1306, and declared that the Bull *Unam sanctam* was neither to do prejudice to France nor

attribute to it any new kind of subjection. Philip pressed for a formal condemnation of Boniface VIII., and Clement was obliged to cause the accusations raised against the latter, which accused him of unbelief, morally frivolous utterances, and the worship of demons, to be investigated by a French and an Italian commission, the protraction of which had at least the result that the King renounced the invidious process and left the decision to the Pope alone. Clement V. had to purchase this by his complaisance in the rejection of the Order of the Templars (*vid. infra*). In the Bull *Rea gloriæ* he freed the King of all guilt in the violent procedure against Boniface, cancelled all sentences and measures which had been adopted by Boniface and his successor since All Saints', 1300, with the exception of the Bull *Unam sanctam*, from which however the sting was taken as regards France by the previous declaration. In this way he at least avoided the scandal of an express repudiation of his predecessor, and the Council at Vienne declared Boniface's innocence. Nevertheless all passages insulting to the King were weeded out of the Register of Boniface. After the death of the German Albert (1308), Clement was obliged by sheer necessity to support Philip's wish to procure the imperial dignity for his brother Charles of Valois, but willingly recognised the German election which fell to HENRY of Luxemburg, after the latter had promised him to refrain in Rome itself from all actions detrimental to the rights of the Pope and the Romans.

The Papacy, while dependent on the French power, sought so much the more to increase its external claims. Against the Republic of Venice, which had taken possession of Ferrara, Clement hurled the ban and interdict in a quite specially aggravated form, attacking its secular relations. When Henry VII., on his march to Rome (1310 sqq.), vindicated the imperial rights and did not allow himself to be interrupted by the Pope as the "liege lord of both parties" in his conflict with King Robert of Naples, the ban against Henry was already uttered when he died in the neighbourhood of Siena (August, 1313). The Pope, as liege lord of the Emperor, now laid claim to make arrangements for the Empire on occasion of the vacancy in the German crown.

JOHN XXII. (1316-34), who after long and even bloody conflicts between the French and Italian parties was finally elected at Lyons in 1316, remained, in spite of his promise to the contrary, in France, in Avignon close to the frontier of the French king. During the conflict of LEWIS the BAVARIAN (1314-47) with Frederick of Austria, John, with the support of King Philip of Valois, interfered in Italian

affairs, where, in opposition to MATTEO VISCONTI of Milan, whom Henry VII. had appointed Imperial Vicar, he made king Robert of Naples Procurator of the Empire in Italy. After Frederick of Austria had been taken prisoner in 1322, the Pope complained that Lewis came forward as Roman King without papal confirmation and supported the Ghibelline party in Italy. Against this Lewis protested, grounding upon the sole right of the electors to choose (Nuremberg, 18th Dec., 1323) and replied to the Pope's ban with the appeal of **Sachsenhausen** (April or May, 1324), in which he appealed from the false Vicar of Christ to a general council and the future legitimate Pope.¹ The interdict which the Pope now issued against Lewis and the Empire met with vigorous resistance and much disobedience in Germany, so that the Archbishop of Salzburg, the decided adherent of the Pope, fled to Austria, where Leopold, even after the reconciliation of his brother Frederick with Lewis, continued the war against the latter till his death in 1326. Frederick did not allow himself to be moved by the Pope to break his word given to Lewis. Lewis now advanced victoriously into Upper Italy and had himself anointed in Rome in 1328 by two bishops of his party and crowned by the aged Sciarra Colonna in the name of the Roman people. John preached the crusade against him, declaring him deposed, and Lewis replied, appealing to the procedure of Otto I., by deposing John and raising a Franciscan (Nicholas V.) to the pontificate. Lewis, however, had soon to withdraw from Italy, and his Pope had to abjure his errors in presence of John XXII. The party of the strict Franciscans did indeed adhere firmly to Lewis, and Occam (*vid. infra*) continued his literary defence of him. But the renewed excommunications of the Pope made more impression in Germany. Frequently in one and the same city the one portion of the clergy and monks obeyed the interdict, the other continued public divine service. Humble advances of the Emperor towards reconciliation came to wreck on John's exaggerated demands and the influence of King Philip VI. of France. Lewis then utilized the accusations of heresy against John which were becoming current. John's doctrine that the souls of the pious departed, until the resurrection of the body, remain without the full possession of the blessedness of the vision of God, might be supported on the authority of the ancient Church, but was regarded as heresy since the judg-

¹ This appeal includes a long and vigorous refutation of the Pope in accordance with the ideas of the Franciscans, who were strictly protected by Lewis. for the theological discussions in which, however, Lewis subsequently denied responsibility.

ment of the University of Paris in 1240, which also determined the French king against it. In 1333, John instituted a learned commission to examine into the question but died before its decision in 1334. Lewis had already attempted with the help of Italian Cardinals to bring about a General Council, when John died. His successor, Benedict XII., spread the rumour that John had recanted on his death-bed.

BENEDICT XII. (1334-42), who had really at heart the reformation of the Church and the establishment of ecclesiastical peace, was only restrained by Philip VI. from being reconciled to Lewis, who was ready to condemn his anti-papal declarations, and to lay down the imperial crown in order to receive it again from the hand of the Pope. A final attempt at reconciliation by the German bishops under the Archbishop of Mayence, HENRY von Virneburg, only revealed the complete unfreedom of the Pope. The real hindrance consisted in the hostile alliance of Lewis with Edward of England against the French king. At **Frankfort** in 1337 the German princes declared the papal judgments against Lewis to be invalid. At the same time Lewis concluded a formal treaty with England against France, and the German electors swore on the 18th July, 1338, at **Lahnstein**, to protect the customs and liberties of the Empire, and on the following day declared at **Rense** that he who was elected to be Roman King required no confirmation by the Roman See. On the 8th August Lewis also declared the right to bear the imperial title to be independent of the papal coronation. The declaration of the electors was elevated into a law of the Empire and those clergy who still desired to observe the interdict were banished. But Lewis again destroyed what had been won, first by untimely concession, when, being outwitted by France, he begged for peace with that country and the papal absolution (1341), and again when he had been once more undeceived, by the divorce of Margaret Maultasch of Tyrol and her marriage with his son Lewis, on whom, in spite of the Pope's protest, he had conferred Brandenburg. By this action he alienated the feeling of the people and at the same time that of the princes.

Benedict's successor, CLEMENT VI. (1342-52), a not ungifted, but haughty and worldly prince of the Church, who sought in every way to prop up his finances, renewed the ban against Lewis in 1346 and confronted his repeated self-humiliations with ever more insolent demands. In the Bull of Thursday in Passion Week in 1346, he demanded a new imperial election with an abundance of imprecations. Five electoral votes actually elected CHARLES IV., the

son of King John of Bohemia. But Lewis retained the superior power till his death in 1347. Charles, the parsons' king, even before his election strongly bound to the Pope, fled to France, and even after Lewis's death was only gradually able to gain authority in opposition to Günther of Schwarzburg. His coronation did not ensue till 1349. In the profoundly excited German people there was an expectation of the return of Frederick II., who was to bring in a golden age, reconcile rich and poor to each other, bring monks and nuns to marriage, and keep down the clergy with a heavy hand.

Under Clement VI. the Papal See, to which in 1273 the county of Venaissan had already been presented, received also the county of Avignon, which Clement purchased from Queen Johanna I. of Naples, born Countess of Provence. She sought protection against King Lewis of Hungary, who was supported by Lewis the Bavarian and who charged her with the murder of her husband, Prince Andreas. Clement gave her at the same time dispensation for her re-marriage with her cousin, Lewis of Tarentum, and supported her in regaining her Italian throne.

In Italy, meanwhile, the local powers were spreading, unhindered by an imperial authority. Venice and Genoa were in conflict, the Viscontis ruled in Milan, the Gonzagas in Mantua; amid perpetual party conflicts Florence gained a great part of Tuscany. The State of the Church, deserted by the Pope, having even at an earlier period fallen asunder into numerous commonwealths, entirely withdrew from the power of the distant Pope. Florence laid hands on it, Bologna became a separate republic, until in 1350 it came under the Viscontis; in Rome the Colonnas and Orsinis quarrelled. Then in 1347 the Apostolic Notary COLA DI RIENZI, as Tribune of the people, for a short time awakened the phantasy of a Roman Republic, till the people, oppressed by taxes, expelled him. For a time Cola found refuge with the heretical Fraticelli in the Abruzzi, then fell into the hands of Charles IV. and was given up to the new Pope Innocent VI. The latter desired to utilize him in combating the anarchy in Rome, where he was received with exultation as Senator, but after a short time slain by the irritated populace.

Innocent VI. (1352-63), a pope of better feeling as a churchman, who exerted himself to limit the utilization of the Church for financial ends and the abuses among the secularized clergy, succeeded, by means of the warlike Cardinal AEGIDIUS ALBORNOZ, from 1353, in gradually again subjecting the greater part of the State of the Church, while the imperial party in Italy in vain expected the

establishment of order from the Roman campaign of Charles IV. in 1354.

URBAN V. (1362-70) was obliged to prosecute the powerful Bernabo Visconti in Milan, who would not surrender Bologna, with the ban and crusade, and even then had to purchase Bologna from him. The growing anarchy in Italy, the increasing impoverishment and decay of the churches in Rome, increased the general discontent with the Babylonian captivity of the Papacy in Avignon. These feelings were reinforced by the deep secularization of the luxurious court in Avignon, which Petrarch as an eye-witness, moved more by classical than ecclesiastical ideas, bitterly scourged, and by the universal indignation at the dependence of the High Priest of Christendom on French policy. In Germany it even became customary to live without any church; in England the national feeling mutinied against the Roman yoke. Edward III. refused the tribute which had been customary since the time of John. The interests of the Church with ever growing imperiousness demanded the return of the Pope to Italy. In 1367 Urban V. tore himself away from Avignon, and hoped for help from the Roman campaign of Charles IV. (1368), but in vain, and in 1370 already returned to Avignon, in despite of the instant prayers of CATHERINE of Siena, who is said to have threatened him with the death which followed shortly, as the penalty of his flight from Italy. While Charles IV. humbly petitioned the new Pope GREGORY XI. (1370-1378) for permission to have his son Wenzel elected as Roman King, the Pope's anathemas were impotent against the Florentines and the Visconti, with whom the again revolted cities of the State of the Church put themselves in alliance. In 1377 Gregory XI. again betook himself to Rome in the endeavour to establish peace by negotiations, in which soon after his death in 1378 his successor Urban VI. was successful. But the French Papacy was now replaced by the aggravated evil of the dissentient Papacy, the time of the schism.

2. The Fall of the Order of the Templars.

Sources : BALUZE, *vid.* p. 445; *Vita Clementis V.* by JOH. of ST. VICTOR, also in the *Recueil des histor. des Gaules*, XXI.; Continuator Guilelmi Nangiacci, BOUQUET, *Receuil*, XX. 585; VILLANI, *vid. sup.*; Acts of process in MICHELET, *Procès des Templiers*, 1841-51; in E. BOUTARIK in the *Notices et extraits des documents inédits relat. à l'histoire de France sous Philippe le Bel*, 1862 and 1871, and in SCHOTTMÜLLER, *der Untergang des Tempelordens*, Berlin 1887, vol. 2.—*Literature* : WILCKE, *Gesch. d. T.O.*, 2nd ed., Halle 1860; SOLDAN, HTb. 1845; W. HAVEMANN, *G. d. Ausgangs d. T.O.*, Stuttg. 1846; SCHWAB, ThQ. 1866; E. BOUTARIK, *La France sous Philippe le Bel*, and *id.* RQH. X. and XI.; H. PRUTZ, *Geheimlehre und Geheimstatuten des T.O.*, Berlin 1879; *id.*, *Culturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge*, 1883; K. WENK, *Clemens V. und Heinrich VII.*, Halle 1882; SCHOTTMÜLLER, l.c. (cf. WENCK in GGA. 1888, 465); H. PRUTZ, *Entwicklung u. Untergang des T.O.*, Berl. 1888.

The poor knights brothers of the Temple (p. 356) had become a rich and haughty Order, whose original duties had long receded in favour of the utilization of its enormous privileges, the administration of its properties in all countries and the self-seeking policy of interests. Its exemption from episcopal jurisdiction disturbed ecclesiastical order and drew down the hatred of the prelates. Pride, arrogance, insubordination, even to the Pope, and disloyalty gradually made it disagreeable to the Pope also. As in all orders which had become rich, immorality and worldly-mindedness invaded the Order; to a large extent the Templars made themselves masters of the commercial and financial business which had become active through the Crusades. Clement IV. already threatened their autocratic procedure with investigation. The ideas of reforming the Order and amalgamating it with its rival, the Order of S. John, which first became current at the Council of Lyons (1274), were again taken up by Nicholas IV. after the fall of Acre (1291). But it was Philip IV. of France, who had inflicted the most decided defeat on the absolutist papacy of Boniface VIII., and who, with the greatest rigour, though also certainly with the greatest tyranny, prosecuted the aim of making harmless the great privileged spiritual Order which injured secular interests everywhere. Like his predecessor Philip III., the Bold, he had attempted to put legal limits on the spread of the property of the spiritual associations. But again he had been driven by political interests to conclude a treaty with the Visitor of the Order in France, Hugo de Peraudo, (1303), and to issue¹ a charter (3rd June, 1304) to the Order for all its properties and rights in France. But

¹ Documents in PRUTZ, *Entwicklung, etc.*, 306 sqq.

to Clement V., his dependent, he imparted immediately on his consecration rumours which implicated the Order. Clement in the summer of 1306 secretly invited the Grand Masters of the Templars and the Knights of S. John to come to him. Then when Philip, on occasion of his meeting with Clement at Poitiers, renewed the charges against the Order, Clement promised investigation, which was also desired by the heads of the Order themselves. But Philip availed himself of the disposition of the higher clergy and the Dominican Inquisitor Imbert against the Order and suddenly (13th October, 1307) caused his officials to seize the Templars in the whole of France and lay their properties under arrest. The very day before, the Grand Master JACQUES DE MOLAY had without any suspicion been a pall bearer at the burial of the King's sister-in-law. Before the Canons and Masters of Paris and then before a larger popular assembly the Templars were accused, to the effect that every entrant into the Order was obliged to deny Christ thrice, to spit upon the Cross, to pay homage to the superiors of the Order by indecent kisses and to promise on oath to surrender himself to the brethren for shameful purposes. Imbert, the King's confessor, with the participation of Nogaret and the Bishop of Paris, carried out a formal process of inquisition, in which, by means of torture and all sorts of artifices, confessions of guilt were extorted from the prisoners (including Molay himself). A priest of the Order also admitted omitting the words of consecration from the mass at the command of the Order. Clement V. complained (27th October, 1307) of the King's arbitrary procedure against an Order which was subject to the Pope alone and demanded the delivery of the persons and properties of the Order to his accredited Cardinals, and also prohibited the Inquisitor and the bishops who had taken part from taking any further steps. But the inquisition went on unhindered, was also extended to other parts of France, and Philip called upon the princes of the West to take like proceedings against the Order. Clement V. saved appearances by calling upon Christian princes to arrest the Templars by means of the Bull *Pastoralis præeminentiæ solio* (22nd November), which he had previously been obliged to lay before the King. At the same time Clement was obliged to testify publicly to the King (1st December) that his procedure against the Templars, though disapproved by the Pope, had proceeded from pure zeal towards the Church. In return, Philip conceded (24th December) that the prisoners should stand under the Pope's hand, and that the properties under arrest should be administered by special royal officials apart from the

royal revenues and with careful observance of their ecclesiastical destination. A parliament to which delegates were also sent from the Third Estate now (1308, beginning of May) approved of the King's procedure and declared by a majority that the Templars were guilty of death. Specially prepared pamphlets created a feeling on the side of the King, petitions were made in the name of the people, and the Pope was charged with being bribed by the Templars. In opposition to the arbitrary steps taken by the King, the Pope exerted himself first of all to get into his own hands the investigation of the Templars, without binding himself from the beginning to condemn them; but he was obliged to give way step by step to the pressure of the King (meeting in Poitiers, May, 1308), and had as it seems neither the power nor the will to make a decided refusal. He expressly gave over the Templars in the French domain to the royal guardianship, and he was obliged to withdraw the suspension he had pronounced upon the French Inquisitors and Prelates. On the other hand it is true that the King allowed seventy-two Templars to be brought before the Pope himself for trial in Poitiers, but the Master and heads of the Order were detained, ostensibly on account of sickness, in the castle of Chinon near Tours, and the Pope was obliged to hand over their trial to a commission composed of three Cardinals of French sympathies and also to arrange for similar commissions of investigation for other countries.¹ In this way the affair was formally brought under the Pope's hand, but at the same time his resistance to the King was practically broken. In the process of inquisition the use of torture was avoided, in consequence of which many Templars declared themselves innocent; not a few were ready to defend the Order.² But the appearance of greater mildness proved deceptive, when the Archbishop of Sens, a favourite of King Philip, at a Provincial Council in Paris, condemned fifty-four Templars who had withdrawn their previous admissions as back-sliding heretics and handed them over to be burned by the secular power (12th May, 1310). Terrified in this way, the majority of those who were tried by the Papal Commission itself returned to their former confession of guilt, and the Commission now served to palliate the previous procedure of the King, who had held out prospects of pardon and grace to all who admitted guilt.

In other countries the trials proceeded in various manners. In

¹ The Bulls *Faciens misericordiam* and *Regnans in celis*, of the 12th Aug., 1308.

² *Vid.* WENCK, GGA., 1888, 504.

England all the prisoners declared themselves innocent, but out of respect to the Pope were obliged to make a confession of a light sort, to abjure and do penance in monastic confinement. In Castile the Synod of Salamanca in 1310 left the judgment on the Templars, who had come with entire innocence out of the investigation, to the decision of the Pope, without, in spite of the instant prayers of the Templars, issuing a declaration of acquittal. In Aragon the Templars, who were combated with force of arms by James II., finally gave their sureties to the Papal Nuntios, and the Pope required the application of torture, against which a Synod of Tarragona interceded for them. Many fled from Portugal. In Italy and Germany the issue of the trials was mostly favourable to the Templars. In Cyprus they had to give themselves up to Amalric, the Vice-regent of the Empire, but asserted their innocence.

The Council of **Vienne**, which was opened in October, 1311, at first demanded further trial of the Order, and the Commission instituted by the Pope for that purpose declared the proofs hitherto adduced against it insufficient. But many ascribed to the Pope the right to declare the abolition of the Order on higher grounds. On him King Philip then put the requisite pressure, and Clement resolved to declare the abolition, but not *de jure* (on the ground of judicial knowledge) but *per modum provisionis seu ordinationis apostolicæ*, i.e. out of regard to the public good of the Church. The abolition was proclaimed in public session in the presence of the King on the 3rd April, 1312.¹ The properties of the Order were to be united to those of the Knights of St. John to all time; they were, however, only under Philip's successors partially and at considerable cost transferred to them, and the Pope reserved the disposition of the properties of the Templars outside of France. Jacques de Molay and a few other heads of the Order were condemned by a Papal Commission to perpetual imprisonment on the ground of their former confession of guilt. But when Jacques de Molay and Godfrey Charney retracted their forced confession and protested, Philip caused them on the same day to be seized and burned (11th March, 1314). All the rest were to be finally judged by provincial synods. Support was to be provided for the acquitted out of the properties of the Order, mercy was to be shown to those who confessed guilt, and only the obstinate and relapsing were to be treated with rigour.

Much lies at the door of the Order in regard both to morals and

¹ On the ground of the Bull of 13th March, *vid.* HEFELE, ThQ., 1866, 63 sqq. and 80 sqq.

to ecclesiastical and political matters, but the trial really proved neither the existence of a heretical and libertine secret league within the Order (Prütz formerly) nor the scandalous customs of initiation (Prutz, *Entwicklung*); on the other hand it revealed on the part of Philip a tyrannical procedure entirely disregarding of moral considerations, which, by utilizing and again by destroying the ecclesiastical process of inquisition, aimed at the annihilation of the Order. But the most melancholy rôle in the whole juggle is played by the French Pope.

3. The Conflicts in the Franciscan Order.

Sources: besides those in WADDING and BALUZE, *Miscellanea*, ed. MANSI, especially in EHRLE, *die Spiritualen*, etc., and id., *zur Vorgesch. des Concils von Vienne* in ALKG., I. 513; II. 155, 125, 356; III. 1 sqq.; cf. DÖLLINGER *Beiträge*, II. 417 sqq.

1. In order to abolish the oppositions within the Franciscan Order described above (p. 416 sqq.) Clement V., at the instigation of Charles II. of Naples, nominated a number of eminent Spirituals, the former General of the Order, RAYMUNDUS GAUFREDI (who, however, died in 1310), UBERTINO DE CASALE, the most important personage, and others, to whom for the period of the negotiations full exemption from the authorities of their Order had to be conceded. The representatives of the community on the other hand reproached the hated Spirituals with connection with the sect of the Free Spirit, and with their admiration for the suspected Johannes Olivi (p. 420). Ubertino, the most skilful representative of the Spirituals, shows, that they were only concerned about the reform of the discipline of the Order in the sense of the Rule and the testament of the founder, with which the community would have nothing to do. Hence their wish was, as it had been earlier, for separation from the Order, and the formation of a religious society of their own. On the 1st March, 1311, the Community raised a protest against the Papal Bull, which they alleged to have been fraudulently obtained, as the Spirituals had already been excommunicated as heretics. They accused Olivi of having become the founder of a dangerous sectarian faction, and, as a matter of fact, a fanatical antipapal feeling had developed amongst the excited Spirituals, which regarded the authority of the Popes as abolished since Nicholas III., and transferred to certain Friars who followed the spirit of evangelical poverty. Olivi was here regarded as the genuine successor of S. Francis. Ubertino's treatise in refutation disclosed the true ground of the opposition to the Spirituals by the

dominant party, viz., resistance to a reformation of the secularized Order, of which Olivi had been such an urgent champion. The final result of the long and heated negotiations was formed, on the one hand, by the dogmatic decree of the Council of Vienne, in which out of the great number of errors alleged against Olivi, only some few were combated as unorthodox, so as to a certain extent to meet the wishes of the community; but, on the other hand, by the Papal Constitution **Exivi de paradiso** of the 6th May, 1313, which with a few limitations essentially declared in the sense of the Spirituals on the Franciscan Rule, viz., that the Order was bound to the so called *usus pauper*, and not merely to the *usus moderatus*. Thus the Order might bring no action at law, own no vineyards, erect no storehouses, sell nothing from its gardens, have no splendid churches or splendid ornaments. In return for this, however, the Pope now required the Spirituals to return to their obedience to their superiors. But their apprehension that the papal decision would remain a dead letter in the hands of the Community was confirmed, when in spite of the good will of the Pope and a few Italian Cardinals (Jacopo Colonna, the patron of Angelo, p. 420) the oppression of the Spirituals went on unhindered in Tuscany and also in Provence. The Pope exiled BONAGRATIA, the chief opponent of the Spirituals, and deposed various influential heads of the Community, and in the summer of 1313 repeated the demand for the submission of the reforming party to their superiors. But the Spirituals in Tuscany already began to help themselves, withdrew from their convents, or where they were in the majority expelled the opposing party by force, and Clement V. now commanded the bishops concerned to suppress the "rebellion." In Provence the new General of the Order, Alexander of Alexandria, in order to establish peace, assigned a few convents, Narbonne, Beziers and Carcassonne to the Spirituals. But after the death of Clement V. (April, 1314) the heads of the community whom he had deposed again gained the helm, and the conflicts went on more vigorously than ever. On the election of John XXII., on the 7th August, 1316, after a long vacancy of the See, the community of the Order set in motion every means of opposing the Spirituals, and that with success. It is true that Angelus de Clareno, the eminent head of the separatist Italian Spirituals, was skilful enough to defend himself with success before John XXII., and to assert his freedom.¹ But John modified the regulations of the Constitution of his predecessor in accordance with the feeling of the community

¹ *Epist. excusatoria* in EHRLE, l.c., I. 515.

of the Order, and broke the resistance of the convents of Narbonne and Beziers to subjection to the authorities of the Order, so that the majority accommodated themselves, and the recalcitrants were handed over to the Inquisition. Then the above class of separate Italian Spirituals, the adherents of a certain Liberatus and Angelus, was cancelled as uneccelesiastical, and all who appealed to the concessions of Celestine V. for their separate position were rejected; so likewise were the extreme Spirituals of southern France and their very numerous adherents among the Franciscan Tertiaries.

During this continued and embittered conflict, the anti-churchly feeling among the zealous adherents of S. Francis had developed into full hostility, and accordingly there now separated from the Order a sect which was regarded by the Church as heretical, the so-called **Fratricelli** (diminutive of the Italian, *frate*). The name originally attaches to the adherents of Angelus de Clareno, but is soon applied generally to the Italian Spirituals who separated themselves from the Order. Not the name, but an essentially similar disposition is exhibited by the persecuted Spirituals in southern France and the Tertiaries (Beguines) who stood under their influence and who here form the real bulk of the pious who had begun to be doubtful about the Church. The ideal of poverty, the equalisation of the Rule of S. Francis with the Gospel of Christ, and apocalyptic views as to the corruption of the Church are their main conceptions.

The Italian Fraticelli, mostly under the protection of feudal lords who were favourable to them, founded a few settlements and chose superiors of their own. Such were the group of Angelo, who was still at their head as leader in 1334, and the Tuscan group of Henry of Ceca. The hermits of Mount Majella, near Castro Morice in Abruzzo Citeriore, among whom Cola di Rienzi lived for a time, seem also to have been Fraticelli of this kind. They lived in the neighbourhood of the Celestinian Abbey of Sancto Spiritu, and therefore near the old hermits, to whom Celestine V. had at one time recommended the Spirituals.¹ Duke Lewis of Durazzo also supported Fraticelli in the neighbourhood of his castle of Monte S. Angelo, whom he often caused to conduct divine worship for him. Against these, partly adherents of Thomas Aquinas, the brother of the former bishop, Innocent caused Cardinal Albornozy to take steps. The Church was universally regarded here as carnal and apostate, the popes since John XXII. as divested of all spiritual power, partly even of the capacity to perform the sacraments. The true

¹ *Vid.* PAPENCORDT, *Cola di Rienzi*, chap. v., appendix No. 10.

Church is among the spiritually poor, from among whom the true Pope is also expected.

In spite of the separation of the Fraticelli from the Minorites the principles of the Spirituals further asserted themselves in the Order. The wife of King Robert, Sanctia, a sister of the Prince who was an adherent of Olivi and Angelo of Clareno (p. 420), in the time of John XXII., made the Court at Naples a place of refuge for the Spirituals who fled from Tuscany and the Mark. After the outbreak of the new controversy as to poverty, which led to the deposition of Cesena, the General of the Order, the Queen took the Brothers of her foundation (*Corporis Christi*, afterwards S. Chiara) under protection against his successor, and obtained the exemption of the convent from his jurisdiction. It was only under Benedict XII. that the consideration shown by John for the royal court ceased. Friar Andreas of Galiano, chaplain to Queen Sanctia, was put on trial in 1338, which, however, ended in his acquittal.

2. A **new controversy as to poverty** now brought Pope John XXII., who had hitherto taken the side of the Community of the Order against the Spirituals, into violent hostility with the Order itself. The assertion which had become traditional among the Spirituals, that Christ and the Apostles had possessed nothing of their own, neither individually nor as a community, had been rejected as heretical by an Inquisitor in the trial of a Beghard. Against this the Franciscan lector Berengarius of Narbonne raised protest, citing Nicholas III.'s Bull "*Exiit*," and appealed to the Roman See. In the conflict with the Dominicans that assertion afforded the Franciscans the pretext for maintaining the fiction, that they also were mere usufructuaries, not proprietors, of the goods of the Church or the Papal See. John XXII. now first of all abolished the prohibition of Nicholas III. to comment on his interpretation of the Franciscan Rule, and declared, agreeing with the Dominicans, that the obstinate assertion that the Lord and the Apostles had no rights of property, or free disposal of it, was false and heretical,¹ and in the name of the Romish Church renounced all right to the property of the Franciscans, and thus brought out the mere legal fiction in the pretext of the Franciscans. The General of the Order, MICHAEL CESENA, Friar BONAGRATIA and the famous OCCAM protested at the Convention of the Order at Perugia in 1322 against this papal decision; Bonagratia appealed before the papal Consistory (Jan., 1323) but was imprisoned. John cited Cesena and Occam to Avignon and kept them in confinement for several years,

¹ Bull, "*Cum inter nonnullos*" of the 12th Nov., 1322.

defended (1324) his constitutions and uttered the ban against his opponents. At the same time the Cesenists took 'the Emperor's side in the conflict of Emperor Lewis with the Pope. In the Appeal of Sachsenhausen (1324, *vid.* p. 447) the complaints against the Pope included expression of the reproaches proceeding from the persecuted Minorites against his heretical assertion that Christ and the Apostles had possessed property. After the assumption by Lewis of the imperial crown, the Minorite chiefs who had hitherto been detained in Avignon fled by ship to the Emperor at Pisa, and Cisena's party¹ allied its fortunes with those of the Ghibellines and subsequently followed Lewis into Germany. A violent literary controversy ensued. Cesena summoned all Minorites against John XXII., William of Occam maintained the cause of the Emperor, and at the same time that of the Cesenists, against the heretical John, who was championed by the Dominicans, *e.g.* by Petrus Paludanus (*Tractatus de paupertate Christi*, etc.). But the opposition of the Cesenists, who, *e.g.* Bonagratia, had themselves offered the most malicious opposition to the strict spirit of the Spirituals, was unable to carry the Order along with it. Already at the General Chapter at Paris (1329) the greater part of the Order submitted. Now that John had cut off the favourite way out of the difficulty, a return was made to the older fiction, that the right of property in the possessions of the Franciscans remained in the hands of the givers.

3. The original spirit of the Poor-folk of S. Francis, which was denied and combated by the community of the Order, finally attained to a recognition of its existence by the authority of the Church. The exertions of Philip of Majorca in this direction came to wreck on the resistance of John XXII. (1328), and subsequently of Benedict XII. (1340), because he was regarded as a favourer of the heretical Beguines. Nevertheless, in 1334, JOHN OF VALLE, still supported by the aged Angelo of Clareno, with the approval of Odo the General of the Order, founded a hermitage (that of S. Bartholomew of Brogliano) not far from Foligno. An authorization of Clement VI.'s (1350) permitted his zealous adherent, Friar Gentile, to found four further hermitages of the strict rule, which were to be withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the authorities of the province. The General Chapter of 1354 did indeed effect the abolition of these brotherhoods with the help of the Cardinal Legate Albornozy, but in 1368 Trincio d'Ugolino de' Trinci, Lord of Foligno, obtained

¹ *Id.* the process against the Franciscans by S. Fortunatus of Todi, ALKG. II., 653.

for his relation PAOLO DE' TRINCI the permission of the Order to establish the Hermitage of Brogliano. The quickly spreading Brotherhood received the papal confirmation in 1373.¹ Paolo remained obedient to the authorities of the Order, and supported the Community against the Fraticelli. At his death (1390) the two provinces of the Order of the **Brothers of the Observance**, the Roman and the Umbrian, already stood in high estimation. Others attached themselves to them in France, Hungary, Spain, etc., still others later on, in the fifteenth century. The French Observants (*fratres regularis observantie*) were expressly recognised at the Council of Kostnitz (23rd Sept., 1415).² It was from among these very Observants that in the fifteenth century important individuals proceeded, who successfully combated the anti-ecclesiastical Fraticelli, Bernardino of Siena, and John of Capistrano, who destroyed about thirty-six settlements of the Fraticelli, reconciled many of them to the Church, but also caused the relapsed to be burned. James of the Mark also worked in the same sense.

4. The Advance of the Anti-papal Theories on Spiritual and Secular Power.

Sources : SCHARD, *Syntagma tractatum de imperiali jurisdictione*, etc., Argent. 1609; GOLDAST, *Monarchia S. Romani imperii*, Frkft. 1668; further literary references in LORENZ, D. Q. § 35.—*Literature* : E. FRIEDBERG, *die mitteltalt. Lehren üb. d. Verhältniss zw. Staat u. Kirche*, Lpz. 1874; LECHLER, *Johann Wiclif*, I. 93 sqq.; RIEZLER, *die literar. Widersacher der Päpste zur Zeit Ludwig's d. B.*, Lpz. 1874; K. MÜLLER, *d. Kampf Ludw. d. B.*, Tüb. 1879 sq.; MAURENBRECHER, *Studien u. Skizzen*, Lpz. 1874, p. 298; BERGER, ZWL, V. 276.

The conflict of the Popes with the Empire had ended with the fall of the Hohenstaufens. Thomas Aquinas developed theoretically the victory of the spiritual power over the secular. The latter, indeed, no longer appeared, as it had to Gregory VII., as merely earthly, undivine, but still it was merely human, natural and only able to serve higher aims in obedience and strict subordination to the spiritual power. Unbelieving or heretical princes may be deposed by the spiritual power and combated with the weapon of excommunication. But the idea that the secular power has a right of its own, now appears successfully sustained by a strong consciousness of national claims in France under Philip IV., le Bel, and breaks through the enclaspings of the state by the papal power and the dissipation and decomposition of political life by spiritual forms.

¹ *Vid.* the papal missives of 22nd June, 1374, in EHRLÉ, ALKG., IV. 184.

² The oldest Observant statutes hitherto printed, in HOWLET, in *Mon. Franz.*, II.

The fall of Boniface VIII. is followed by the slavery of the French Papacy and the ruin of the Templars. It is chiefly in France that ecclesiastical and political legal ideas as to the independent value of the secular power receive growing importance. To the Proctor Pierre Dubois (de Bosco), who stood on close personal terms with King Philip, is ascribed the *Quæstio de potestate papæ*¹ which energetically combats the claims of the Pope to a universal secular jurisdiction. The daring *Disputatio inter militem et clericum*, ascribed² with doubtful correctness to Occam, in the form of a popular dialogue maintains the view that the spiritual power is only to be measured according to the saying of Christ ("my kingdom is not of this world"). The successors of Peter are mere priests and bishops; the power of the keys has only to do with sins, not with legal offences of a secular character. The Church has no independent right to secular property, and no claim to exemption from taxation. The Dominican John of Paris (†1306) teaches (*De potestate regia et papali*), that the secular power has indeed to receive the light of the truth of the faith from the spiritual sun, but for the rest is as immediately instituted by God as the spiritual. The latter holds secular property and secular dominion only in virtue of presentation or investiture by the secular.

Similar tendencies awaken in Germany also from the time of Henry VII. and Lewis the Bavarian, but are here amalgamated with the ideas of the universal vocation of the Roman-German Empire as a Christian world-empire, ideas which, though long kept in the shade by facts and combated by the awakening of the national consciousness, especially in France and England, still exercise a great influence over men's minds. Under the influence of such ideas JORDAN of OSNABRÜCK³ works in Germany for the authority and independent right of the Roman King as opposed to the Papacy. As the priesthood had fallen to the Romans, and study to the French, the *imperium* had fallen to the Germans. Abbot ENGELBERT of Admont (†1331) also sees in the fact that a few Christian kingdoms stand outside the Empire which is properly conceived as universal, only an exception to the rule resting on special privileges, and the falling away of some kingdoms from the Empire which was to be expected in these later times he at the same time regards as a falling away from the faith in the time of anti-Christ.

The Ghibelline DANTE, too, still adheres firmly to the necessity of the universal monarchy, the bearer of which in the name of the Roman people is the Roman Emperor; he has his rank directly from God, just as the Pope has his. The mingling of the two powers serves to corrupt both, and a fundamental reformation of the Papacy and the Church is expected from the restoration of the Roman empire. LUPOLD of Bebenburg too (*De juribus regni et imperii* and *Ritmati-*

¹ DUPUIS, *Preuve*, etc., p. 663.

² RIEZLER conceives Dubois to be the author.

³ *Vid.* AGGW., XIV., 1868.

cum querulosum) is still dominated by these ideas, as he defends the rights of the Roman King chosen by the electors as independent of papal confirmation and coronation, and combats the conception of the oath to be rendered to the Pope as a feudal oath.

But the foundations of the curialistic theory are assailed in a much more comprehensive fashion by the famous **Defensor pacis**, with which the Italian MARSIGLIO (Marsilius Paduanus), teacher of theology, philosophy and medicine in Paris, and JOHN of JANDUNO repaired to Lewis the Bavarian about 1324. Marsilius had certainly the chief share in the work. He regards the undue exaltation of the priesthood as the real cause of all the discontent in the world. The claims of the popes, grounded on the *plenitudo potestatis* alleged to have been bestowed on the successors of Peter, are contradictory of the true nature of the Church as a society of all who believe in Christ and bear a spiritual character. The priestly *potestas* refers merely to the proclamation of doctrine and the administration of the sacraments, the so-called power of the keys only to the sacrament of penance. What in it appears as judicial authority (forgiving or retaining sins), is solely God's concern; the priest is merely a doorkeeper, and announcer, not the exerciser of a judicial authority; the court is God's. A hypocrite cannot be helped by the priest's absolution, a true penitent cannot be injured by its being reserved. But excommunication with its far-reaching consequences can only be the attribute of the community of believers or their representatives, a general Council. No judicial or forcible authority belongs either to the Pope or to any priest whatever, either over secular persons or communities, or over priests, except in consequence of its having been conferred by secular legislators. The judicial and penal power which belongs exclusively to the secular power also extends over all secular actions of priests. The exemption of the clergy and spiritual institutions from secular jurisdiction menaces the state to the uttermost. The government is entitled to limit the number of priests in the country.

The nature of the Church involves that true obedience to the evangelical law cannot be enforced by penalty. The priest can only teach, counsel, warn. In regard to heresy the priest has the power of cognition, but the executive power belongs to the prince alone in accordance with the standard of secular law. In accordance with his purely spiritual conception of the priesthood the author regards the command of evangelical poverty as binding for the priesthood. The latter has no such right of property as to be able to reacquire by judicial process what he has been robbed of.

The ecclesiastico-political radicalism of Marsilius further asserts the essential equality of all priests, the right of the community of believers to the appointment of bishops and pastors, the right of the bestowal of the *temporalia*, the spiritual fiefs, by their founders. He regards Holy Scripture alone as the source of the one Catholic faith; submission is due only to the word of Scripture and the inferences which are drawn from it, and in doubtful cases, to the interpretation of a General Council. And even in presence of the infallibility, which is claimed by the popes but refuted by the facts of history, the decision lies with the General Council, which it is the duty of the Christian secular law-giver to call and to watch over as the natural representative of the Christian national community conceived as sovereign.

The enhanced secular ideas now find a real reinforcement in the ascetic opposition to the hierarchy which postures as the world-power. The Spirituals, indeed, with their apocalyptic view of the anti-Christian character of the Papacy are reduced to subjection, but the Cesenists too, in their conflict with John XXII., find something anti-Christian in the papal view of the kingdom of Christ as a secular kingdom. The great schoolman OCCAM accuses the Pope of heresy, of undermining the imperial rights and, at the same time, the faith of the Minorites in evangelical poverty; like Marsilius, he takes under his protection the arbitrary procedure of Lewis the Bavarian in the affair of the divorce of Margaretha Maultasch. In John's requirement that no one should take a side in newly suggested questions of the faith before the papal decision, he sees an attempt on Christian freedom of belief. Occam's reforming conceptions go furthest in the **Dialogus**, which was planned on a large scale, but which has not been entirely preserved. The worst heresy of Pope John, he says, is that according to him the Christian faith would have to be dependent on the decision of each and every pope. Under a sense of the free responsibility of belief he not only combats the infallibility of the Pope, but also finds no absolute security in the decision of a General Council. God is able to find a refuge for the truth in a pious layman, and even in women and infant children, and cause it to issue thence victoriously. But after all the last resource against hierarchical violence lies in the Christian communities and the Council which is formed from them, as also on the other hand in the Emperor as the representative of the Christian people. In contrast to the right of the secular power he on the whole ascribes to the Pope only a limited compulsory power; indeed he sees in the Papacy an institution neither essential nor

necessary to the Church. In certain circumstances an aristocratic constitution of the Church under several popes or primates might be conceived.

The *Somnium viridarii*, which had its origin in France under Charles V about 1377, turns the new ideas to account in a more popular fashion, by working up, in the form of a vision seen in a garden, the above-mentioned *Disputatio inter militem et clericum* and extracts from Occam's Dialogue into attacks on the papal system.

Defenders of the papal system naturally also come forward in opposition to such radical ideas. The Spanish Franciscan ALVARUS PELAGIUS, the papal penitentiary in Avignon and finally bishop (†1352), a vehement opponent of Cesena, in his treatise *De planctu ecclesie* does not indeed veil the secularization of the Church up to the papal Curia, but sets up the Pope as the source of every right and all laws and his will as the highest standard of authority, and ascribes to him unlimited power over princes. Bishops and councils also have their authority entirely from the Pope. At the same time he shrinks from the infallibility of the Pope. The latter can lay claim to no obedience if he sets himself in dogmatic opposition to the whole of Christendom; but he cannot be dragged before an earthly tribunal. The same extreme claims of papal absolutism, though here also with avoidance of the question of infallibility, are found in the Augustinian AUGUSTINUS TRIUMPHUS (*Summa de potestate ecclesie*, etc.).

As an echo of the excited debates on ecclesiastical politics there appear the tractates of the German CONRAD von Megenberg in Ratisbon (†1374), a very fertile author, who specially champions the papal principles against Occam; *vid.* HÖFLER, *Aus Avignon*, p. 24 sqq.

5. The Revolution in Scholastic Theology.

Sources: THOMAS DE BRADWARDINA, *De causa dei et de virtute causarum*, Lond. 1618; DURANDUS DE ST. PORCIANO, *Comment. in V. libros sentent. Lomb.* Paris 1508, and frequently there and in Lyons and Venice; GUILIELMUS OCCAM, *Expositio aurea super totam artem veterem*, Bologna 1496; *Summula logices* or *Tractatus log.* in III. pts. *div.*, Lugd. 1483 and frequently; *Centilogium* (— *loquium*), Lugd. 1494; his ecclesiastico-political writings, *vid.* pp. 460 and 463. *Literature*: p. 368 and K. WERNER, *die Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters*, 4 vols., Wien 1881–87; id., *die nachscholastische Scholastik*, Wien 1884.

Profound changes are also exhibited in the sphere of theology.

1. The theology of Thomas Aquinas is continued by his nearest disciples, AEGIDIUS COLONNA from Rome, TOLOMEO (Ptolemæus or Bartholomæus) from Lucca, JOHN of Paris, and HERVÆUS NATALIS (†1326). Also THOMAS BRADWARDINA, educated in Oxford and a teacher there, afterwards confessor to Edward III. on his French campaigns, finally for a few weeks Archbishop of Canterbury, and dying as such in 1349, stands distinctly on a Thomist foundation, but exhibits a strong element of religious and moral pathos out-reaching the scholastic forms in the spirit of Augustine, with which in the treatise *De causa dei et virtute causarum* (cf. LECHLER, *J. Wiclif*, I.

229 sqq.), on the basis of personal experience, he energetically combats the Pelagianism which had profoundly permeated the spirit of the Church, and maintains the free divine grace and even advances to the most decided doctrine of predestination.

The Dominican Order had already declared Thomas to be *Doctor ordinis* in 1286, and bound itself to champion his doctrines. In the beginning of the fourteenth century the Franciscan Order followed with a similar attitude towards DUNS SCOTUS as its scholastic head; a statute of the Order required that all lecturers and masters in philosophy and theology should follow his doctrines. Outstanding among his personal pupils was FRANCISCUS MAYRON (†1325), the teacher at the Sorbonne in Paris. The jealousy between the orders, already so strong, now nourished the opposition of the scholastic parties of the **Thomists** and **Scotists**, and fostered this opposition traditionally in a series of controversies on theological questions, which, however, were also essentially connected with distinctions in the sphere of philosophy between the more Platonic realism of Thomas and the more Aristotelian of Scotus. With Thomas the conception of the idea of God was determined by the notion of the unity of substance which proceeded from the theology of the fathers, that of Scotus by his individualism which conceived God above all as will and even absolute caprice. Thomas, standing nearer to Augustinian speculation, was a determinist thinker, and also in the doctrine of sin and grace devoted himself to a modified Augustinianism, Scotus was led to more Semipelagian principles. Thomas based the doctrine of redemption on the merit, infinite in its nature, of the suffering of the God-man, Scotus on the sovereign decision of the will of God, who had declared His willingness to accept the merit of Christ as adequate (*acceptatio gratuita*). But, for the Church, the doctrinal difference which stood out most strongly consisted in the decided defence of the doctrine of the *immaculata conceptio* of the Virgin by the Scotists, to which doctrine the Thomists were opposed with equal decision. It was only in our own century that Pius IX. ventured to raise this controverted doctrine into a dogma recognised by the Church.

2. The stricter separation of philosophy and theology which is already announced in Scotus is now decidedly effectuated in connection with the revival and acquisition of power by Nominalism. While Thomists and Scotists continued their traditional controversies, more original thinkers completed the breach between faith and knowledge, out of the hearty union of which Scholasticism had arisen. The Dominican DURANDUS of ST. POURÇAIN (de So. Por-

ciano), teacher of theology at Paris, then *Magister sacri palatii* with Clement V. at Avignon, finally Bishop of Meaux (†1334), at first a decided adherent of the Thomist doctrine, afterwards resolutely separated himself from it (*doctor resolutissimus*), and in all points which were not matters of faith preferred the support of *ratio* to that of any human authority. In the question as to evangelical poverty he indeed championed the papal sentence of John XXII.; but in the controversy as to the *visio beata* he, as likewise many Thomists, declared against the same Pope. With a strong tendency towards the **Nominalist** mode of thought, he began to criticise the traditional realism, conceiving universal ideas to have arisen merely out of the grouping of many similar things in the unity of presentation, and therefore regards genus and species as only designating in an indefinite way that which is exhibited in a definite way in the individual thing. Clear knowledge is only such as has the individual for object. In numerous special points of doctrine he shows himself to be superior to the Thomist scholastic doctrine. The bond between theology and philosophy, between faith and knowledge, he loosened even more than Duns Scotus, and was inclined to deny to theology the character of a science. But WILLIAM OCCAM (born in 1280 at Occam in the English county of Surrey, educated at Oxford and Paris) renewed **Nominalism** more decidedly (*venerabilis inceptor*). Involved as Provincial of the Franciscan Order in the conflicts already described, he lived for the most part in Munich. It was only after the death of Günther of Schwarzburg (June, 1348) that he sought reconciliation with the Pope, but it remains doubtful whether the abjuration which was demanded by Pope Clement VI. really took place. In the *Expositio aurea super totam artem veterem*, a development of the whole of logic and the doctrine of knowledge, he criticises Realism and recalls men from the false methods of the moderns to the Aristotelian logic. For him universal ideas do not exist *extra animum*, and are only objects of presentation, which inwardly reproduces the immediate first images of the perception of things, signs, whereby the soul designates the perceived object and a multiplicity of similar objects. All knowledge is based on outward and inward experience, and therefore excludes the knowledge of supersensuous things, which, hence, cannot be rationally treated by means of evidence. Out of this nominalist doctrine of knowledge there proceeds for him an entirely incommensurable relation between faith and knowledge, theological and philosophical truth. Theology is not a science in the proper sense, because it lacks knowable content, and accordingly the neces-

sary scientific form of proof in the strict sense ; it is based neither on intuition (experience) nor on convincing argumentation. Hence there is no evident knowledge in the case of the truths of faith ; they rest solely on authority. As Occam acknowledges divine revelation alone as such authority, only what is explicitly or implicitly declared in the canon of the Bible is regarded by him as Catholic truth, to be believed for the sake of salvation. His sharp ecclesiastico-political opposition causes him not to recognise in ecclesiastical tradition a source of equal value with revelation ; on the other hand his decided dogmatic positivism causes him to assume a special extraordinary revelation for certain principles of ecclesiastical dogma, especially for the doctrine of transubstantiation, which cannot be verified from Scripture. He is unwearied in discussing the dogmas of the Church in his theological writings (the *Quæstiones* on the sentences of the Lombard, the *Quodlibeta*, the *Centilogium* or *Centiloquium theologicum*, and the special investigations on the sacrament of the altar and on Predestination), and seeks to show that all logico-metaphysical treatment of dogmas necessarily leads into contradictions, and that the laws of logic are only valid for the world of phenomena. But this thorough criticism does not in this case serve a sceptical disposition, but is allied, even by the utter distinction of theology from philosophy, with a rigid ecclesiastical positivism in regard to dogma.

Although the faculty of Arts at Paris, where JOHN BURIDAN, the zealous adherent of Occam's Nominalism, worked, interdicted Nominalism (whoever propounded this doctrine was to be prohibited from lecturing for a year), and although in Oxford violent conflicts took place over it, and in Prague the hatred of the Bohemians to the Germans utilized the Nominalism of the latter as a motive for their expulsion, nevertheless it advanced victoriously ; and in Germany Conrad of Megenberg (p. 464) complained that Occam had already attracted a third of all the scholastic teachers to his side (HÖFLER, *Aus Avignon*, Prag 1868).

6. German Speculative Mysticism from the Time of Eckart.

Sources and Literature: BÖHRINGER, *d. dtsh. Mystik*, 1855 (K. Chr., III. 2); GREITH, *d. d. Mystik im Predigerorden*, Freib. 1861; E. BÖHMER in *Damaris*, 1865; JUNDT, *vid.* p. 426; W. PREGER, *G. d. dtsh. Myst.*, 2 vols., Lpz. 1875 and 1882; FR. PFEIFFER, *d. dtsh. Mystiker des 14. Jh.*; M. ECKART: the text in PFEIFFER and ZDA. VIII. and XV.; the Latin writings in DENIFLE in ALKG. II., 1886; the monographs of MARTENSEN, Hamb. 1842; C. SCHMIDT, StKr. 1839; E. BACH, Wien 1864; A. LASSON, 1866; and in UEBERWEG, *G. d. Phil.*, 5th ed., II.; JUNDT, *Essai sur le myst. spec. de M.E.*, Strassb. 1891; DENIFLE *lc.*; JOH. TAULER, *Sermon des grossen . . . Doctoris J.T.*, Lpz. 1498, Bas. 1521 and Cöln 1543; redaction in modern German by SCHLOSSER, Frkf. 1826, HAMBERGER 1864 and 1872; on the pursuit of the poor life of Christ, *vid.* DENIFLE, *das Buch von der geistlichen Armuth*, München 1877; on the book on the conversion of T. *vid.* the next section; C. SCHMIDT, *J.T.*, 1841; PREGER in ZhTh. 1869; H. NOBBE in ZiTh. 1876; HEINRICH SUSO, *d. deutschen Schriften*, Augsb. 1482, 1512, in a Latin version by SURIUS, Col. 1555 and 1588; *Horologium sapientiae*, Venet. 1492, and frequently, new ed. after MSS. by DENIFLE, Münch. 1876-80, 3 vols.; M. DIEPENBROCK, *Suso's Leben u. Schr.*, 3rd ed., Regsb. 1854; C. SCHMIDT, StKr. 1843; JOH. RUYSBROEK, *opp.* in a Latin version by SURIUS, Col. 1552, High German by GOTTFR. ARNOLD, Offenb. 1701; in the original: A. v. ARNSWALD, *vier Schr. von J.R.*, Hamb. 1848; ENGELHARDT, *vid.* p. 377; VAN OTTERLE, *J.R.*, Amstrd. 1874; ULLMANN, *Reformatoren vor d. Ref.*, 2nd ed., 1866, II.; EIN DEUTSCH THEOLOGIA, edited by M. LUTHER 1516 and complete in 1518; critical edition by FR. PFEIFFER, Stuttg. 1851, with modern German translation in 1855 and Gütersloh 1875; on it LISCO, Stuttg. 1857; F. REIFRATH, Halle 1863; G. PLITT, ZhTh. 1865; HESS, JprTh. 1885.

On the basis of the scholastic theology, there is raised, in the German language and fertilised by the depth of the German mind, a mysticism which gains mighty influence on the pursuit of the life of piety and also on the agitated lay world. The Dominican master, ECKART, born in Strassburg (or Thuringia?), was still a pupil of Albert the Great. Having become Master in Paris in 1302, he occupied influential positions in his Order (Provincial for Saxony, Vicar-General for Bohemia); he was chosen Provincial of the Order for the province of Upper Germany in 1310, but not confirmed, then wrought as a teacher in Paris, Strassburg, and finally as reading master at the Studium generale of the Dominicans at Cologne, where he died in 1327. Called before the Inquisition at the instigation of Archbishop Henry of Virneburg, he raised a protest, and refuted the accusation in a sermon, but at the same time declared himself ready to recall any errors that might be proved against him. After his death, Pope John XXII. rejected a number of propositions imputed to him as heretical, but regarded that declaration of Eckart's as having already made his recantation.

Eckart's speculation rests on Thomas, especially on the Areopagitic elements accepted by the latter and by Albert, to which however his **German** writings, which serve the purposes of a lofty style of edification, afford a new life. The intellectual absorption in God as the being of all things, the intuition which abstracts from all finite distinctions, the unity with God which flashes up in the depth of the soul is turned into practical religious absorption; the abstraction of knowledge becomes flight from what is particular and selfish, in order to "land" in the sea of the Godhead; the enhanced intellectualism becomes intense practical conduct. This "spiritualised Thomism" (Lasson), in the immediate self-assurance of mystical speculation, breaks through the limits which the schools had erected between natural and revealed theology, and treats all religious truths as accessible to the knowing reason, but divests them of their dogmatic character. THEODERIC of Freiburg also, like Eckart, a pupil of Albert, who shows the way to perfect composure through a secluded life and surrender of one's own will, fell under suspicion of heresy on account of a tractate on the working and possible reason.

Among the numerous pupils of the school-making Eckart, his fellow member of the Order, JOHN TAULER, stands pre-eminent on account of his practical activity. Born in Strassburg about 1300, he studied in Cologne at the time when Eckart's doctrine called forth great commotion, then wrought in Strassburg as a powerful preacher and pastor, till the Convent of the Order there (1339) was compelled by the superiors of the Order to obey the interdict issued by the Pope in the conflict with Lewis the Bavarian, and suspend mass, and was therefore expelled the imperial city. Tauler went to Bâle, where he was on terms of intimate intercourse with the Friends of God; so likewise in Strassburg after his return, where he died in 1361. He also worked for a while in Cologne.

He exerts himself to guard Eckart, whom he venerates, against a connection with the sect of the Free Spirit, but moves in the grooves of Eckart's mysticism, the ideas of the divine abyss, in which God and all things rest in undifferentiated unity, of the eternal issuing of God into the distinction of persons and of His eternal return, of the nature of God who alone is life and nature in all things, of the formation of man according to the eternal type in His Son, and the transformed image or spark of God in the depth of the soul, from which the created image of God in man is again fashioned, so that God produces His Son in men also, etc. But these speculative elements, in the interest of the pious govern-

ment of souls, in close attachment to the doctrine and saving ordinances of the Church, are here developed with great warmth and impressiveness, into the apprehension of the divine grace in Word and Sacrament on the basis of repentance, *i.e.* aversion from everything that is not God, and turning towards the unmixed good, which is God. The apprehension of the divine forgiveness of sins brings great peace in trust in God's promise, and kindles the flames of love which seeks to serve God eternally. As we become naked and empty of all things, the inspiration of the divine communication of grace advances upon the different degrees of the beginning, increasing and perfecting man on to the mystical end of being raised in and up to the divine nature in which man becomes one life and nature with God. With all the ascetic ideas which influence him, his cordial liberal spirit and pastoral tact preserves Tauler from a narrow legalistic conception, and on the other hand from losing himself in quietism. The dying away of the personal will is accompanied side by side by the sober fulfilment of the duty of loving one's neighbour, which is more important than exaggerated chastisement. His sermons, for the most part, but not exclusively, preached before monastic congregations, explain the high esteem in which he was held as a pastor among the pious and even in wider popular circles.

HENRY SUSO (Siuse, Seuse, as he named himself after his mother's family name), the son of a knight of Berg in Upper Lingen, was while a youth committed to the Dominican monastery at Constance and, after his study at Cologne under Eckart (1325-1328), became Rector and Prior at Constance. Devoted for years to the most extreme mortifications, he wrestled with his warm heart to be filled with [the highest good, the yearning love, which only flows out of the bottomless abyss of the Godhead. He passes through the most abrupt contrasts, between the loftiest exaltation and the deepest depression and desolation; for years, with "crying heart and weeping eyes," he fought with gnawing doubts. In his mysticism, which is influenced by Eckart, who finally also caused him to relinquish his exaggerated self-tortures, the soul sinks down in deep calm into itself, receives all things from God and not from creatures in silent patience, and sinks into the beingless depth. He took the part of his master Eckart against the Free Spirits, who appealed to his speculations, but himself fell under suspicion of heresy, and after negotiations in Herzogenbusch, was deposed from his priorate by the convention of Brügge (1333). Nevertheless his **Book of Wisdom**, the Latin version of which (*Horologium æternæ sapientiæ*) he dedicated to the master of his Order, shows him again

on good terms with the latter. He believes himself to be espoused, by a special act of divine grace, to the eternal wisdom, which he depicts in images from the Song of Songs. He then received the mystical name AMANDUS. But the eternal wisdom also says to him: "no man shall enjoy me any longer in my sweetness, except those who are in vehement bitterness with me." With his convent he was obliged in 1339 to leave the imperially disposed city on account of the interdict. During several years' wanderings we now find him in hearty alliance with many Friends of God; both personally and by letters he exercises a great influence, especially on the female sex. After his return to Constance he had to suffer grievously from the slander of a hypocritical woman, but succeeded in establishing his injured reputation, and died at Ulm in 1361. His spiritual friend ELISE STAGEL, in the convent of Tösz, near Winterthur, wrote his life, which Suso himself then partly included, and provided with pictures and sayings and a number of letters collected by her, in the collection of his German writings, which he himself supervised.

JOHN OF RUYSBROEK (Rusbroek), a village not far from Brussels, unfolded his mystical contemplations, which were also under Eckart's influence, in the Flemish language, of which he is the best prose writer. As secular priest at the Church of S. Gundula at Brussels, and a man of gentle and pious character, he stood on intimate terms with the Sisters of S. Clare there. In 1350 he sent his "Ornament for the Spiritual Marriage" to the Friends of God on the Upper Rhine. Subsequently he entered the newly founded monastery of the Augustinian Canons at Grönendal, near Brussels, and lived for the most part in the silence of contemplation, the records of which he conceived to have originated under the influence of the Spirit (*Doctor ecstaticus*). He died in great veneration in 1381. On the three degrees of the working, inward, and contemplative life he raises himself to the state of being in the form of God, in which God is blessed in us and we in Him, and God Himself works in the highest nobility of the spirit. But at the same time moral moderation protects him from the perils of the Free Spirit, pantheistic intoxication and antinomian libertinism.

In a whole series of preachers, especially of the Dominican Order, but also of the Minorites and others, the spirit of Eckart and Tauler continued to work, and penetrated and impregnated the increasing edificatory literature in the vernacular. Of such are the Dominicans NICHOLAS of Strassburg, GISELER of Slatheim (Schlotheim) and others; also the book on the pursuit of the poor life of Christ, which

was not by Tauler, but by a Minorite author. Of special importance is the treatise, first published by Luther under the title of "**ein deutsch Theologia**," by an otherwise unknown priest and custos of the Deutschherren at Frankfort-on-the-Main, which Luther calls a spiritually noble little book on the right difference and understanding of what are the old and the new man, Adam and the child of God, and how Adam must die away and Christ arise in us. Of the book, which has been translated into many languages, a MS. which is certainly early (of 1497), has recently been found, which notes the Frankforter as the author. This purified product of the mysticism of the Friends of God also separates (in the preface) mysticism proper from the degenerate speculation of the Brethren of the Free Spirit, which is puffed up, and transgressing all the limits of ecclesiastical order and the voice of conscience, abandons the path of humility and self-denying obedience.

7. The Mystical Pietism of the Friends of God.

Sources and literature: W. PREGER l.c.; JUNDT, *les amis de Dieu* au 18. s., Par. 1879; C. SCHMIDT, *Rul. Merswin* in the *Revue d'Alsace*, 1856; id., *des Nikolaus von Basel Bericht von der Bekehrung Taulers*, Strassb. 1876; id., *Nikolaus von Basel*, Wien 1866; cf. R.M.'s writings edited by Schmidt, the *Buch von d. 9 Felsen*, Lpz. 1879; *vom anfahenden Leben* in the *Strassb. Beitr.* V. (the same in old Dutch translation edited by BERSSUM WAATKES, Leuwarden 1882); the *Bannerbüchlein* in JUNDT l.c.; H. S. DENIFLE, *Tauler's Bekehrung, kritisch unters.*, Strassb. 1879; id., *die Dichtungen der Gottesfr.*: in *ZdA.* XXIV. and XXV.; LÜTOLF, *d. Gottesfr.* in *Jhb. f. schweiz. G.* 1877., and *ThQ.*, 1876; PREGER in *SBA.* 1887, II., 544; CHRIST. EßNER, *v. d. Gnaden Ueberlast*, BLV. 1871 (vol. 108); PH. STRAUCH, *die Offenbarungen der Adelheid Langmann*, Strassb. 1878; id. *Margar. Eßner u. Heinrich v. Nördlingen*, Freib. 1882.

The mysticism of the character described stands amid a broader stream of Christian life, which is promoted by it and in turn sustains it. Under the sense of universal ecclesiastical corruption and under the pressure of the ecclesiastico-political conflicts which confused men's consciences and of other miseries of the age (the Black Death from 1347 to 1350), profounder minds sought for better religious satisfaction than mere obedience to the ordinances and precepts of the Church by turning to the inner life. Through the increased strength of the mother tongue inward freedom grows in the mutual exchange of like-minded souls. The silent in the land find themselves in the possession of a developed inward life and feel themselves to be the salt of the earth. There arises the mystical pietism of the **Friends of God**, who delay the threatening judgment of God by their prayers. They are completely under the religious-moral

ideal of the Mediæval Church (asceticism and contemplation). But the bold flight of mysticism comes into collision with the firm vault of ecclesiastical doctrine, and its inner warmth, along with the deepening of religion, brings intellectual emancipation in the distinction of authority and the gaining of personal livelihood, and of acquired scholastic wisdom and inner experience. The monasteries of the Dominicans (monks and nuns) as also of the Franciscans and Augustinians are the foci of the movement, but it also reaches further into the lay world. The native of Strassburg, RULMANN MERSWIN, a rich merchant and banker, in consequence of a sudden "turning," retires from his business concerns, devotes his resources to benevolent aims, and seeks by means of chastisements, which Tauler, in his character as pastor, is said to have moderated, to attain perfect calm in God's will. His writings give expression in a figurative manner to the well-known ideas on the return of man to God and mystical intuition by mortifying self. With a view to the imminent divine judgment the true friends of God, fighting under the banner of Christ, stand opposed to the false Free Spirits under the banner of Lucifer. In 1366, Merswin bought an old monastery on an island in the Ill near Strassburg (the so-called Green Wört) and made it a house of God and residence of pious Friends of God, and finally presented it to the Order of S. John. Here he lived in seclusion amid chastisements and ecstasies till his death in 1382, but during his life exercised dominant influence over his foundation. His writings, hitherto concealed, he bequeathed to the Order of S. John; among them there was also "the Book of the Master," in which "the Friend of God in the Oberland," the ideal of a friend of God living apart, hidden in God, plays a great part.

"The dear Friend of God, Rulmann Merswin's comrade," being allured by the reputation of a master of Holy Scripture, came a journey of more than thirty miles to his city, but, though himself a layman, he convinced the famous master of the fact that he was not yet possessed of the right spirit, and did not yet stand in the pure love of God. He taught him the A B C of the true godliness, and forbade him to study or preach for two years in order to lead him into the way of simplicity and self-denial. The master then preaches with so much the greater power, and delivers to the Friend of God, who had been called in to his deathbed, the history of his conversion, in order that he might make a book of it. The Friend of God sends the book to the Knights of S. John, ostensibly in the year 1369. According to a conjecture not remote, if we presuppose that the book was historical, TAULER was universally regarded as the famous master. Following a more recent MS. of Tauler's sermons, the book was printed as a "*History of the venerable Doctor Tauler*" and received as such, and Carl Schmidt believed that in the mysterious Friend of God he could recognise a certain heretical Nicholas of Bâle who was burned at Vienna in the beginning

of the fifteenth century. But DENIFLE has shown the impossibility of taking this edificatory *Tendenzschrift* historically and referring it to Tauler, and thereby at the same time greatly shattered the historical character of the form of the Friend of God in the Oberland, which was intentionally kept in dubious twilight. According to the writings and letters ascribed to him, he would be the son of a merchant in Switzerland, who after his conversion renounced his bride to devote himself in a life of seclusion to intercourse with the Friends of God. In Strassburg he is said to have entered into a spiritual alliance with Rulmann Merswin. With like-minded companions (the five men) he withdrew about 1376 into hiding in the Swiss mountains, addressed through Rulmann's mediation exhortations to Gregory XI., who had returned to Rome, and finally lived with his companions as God's prisoner (*incluse*), and soon thereafter was able to announce to Merswin his departure. What the individual writings ascribed to the Friend of God communicate regarding his life, is in the most favourable case a strong mixture of truth and fancy, and R. Merswin himself, as the sole person who ostensibly sees behind the veil, undoubtedly was largely concerned in it. DENIFLE would regard the whole figure as a pious invention of R. Merswin's, but it is hard to believe in this degree of pious deceit on the one hand and in innocent simplicity on the other. C. Schmidt's explanation of Nicholas of Bâle has been given up by himself, but Lütolf also, who thought it was a hermit in the Canton of Lucerne, and Jundt, who thought of a similar person on the Rütberg in St. Gall and called him from his home John of Chur (*vid. RE. s.v.*), only reach uncertain conjectures.

Into this broadening stream of the pietistic and mystical movement there now flows the mystical disposition with its conditions of visionary ecstasy, which had already been fostered in the nunneries in the thirteenth century. The relation of pious priests of the Order as confessors to the mystically excited nuns often took the form of a very cordial spiritual friendship and guidance of the soul, but often, too, took the form of extravagant pampering of the feelings. The pastor becomes the humble admirer of the fair confessor whom he guides, as a costly vessel of divine grace whose spiritual experiences appear as divine revelations.

CHRISTINE EBNER, of a Nuremberg patrician family, a nun in the convent of Engelthal (Nuremberg district), recorded in the treatise on the "Over-load of Grace," all the graces, *i.e.* revelations which had been communicated to previous nuns of this convent. This book, as also the revelations of MARGARETHE EBNER in the nunnery of Medingen, near Donauwörth, and the correspondence of her spiritual friend HENRY of Nördlingen with her and other like-minded persons, finally the revelations of ADELHEID LANGMANN in Engelthal, show how in these circles the extraordinary visionary phenomena which almost became the rule, nearly overgrew the kernel of ascetic and contemplative mysticism with their spiritual life of phantasy and emotion.

8. The Beguines (Beguini, Beghardi, Beguinæ) and the Sect of the Free Spirit.

Sources and Literature: J. B. v. MOSHEIM, *de Beghardis et Beguinabus comment.*, ed. G. H. MARTINI, Lips. 1790; UHLHORN, *die christl. Liebesthätigkeit im MA.*, p. 376 sqq.; *Compilatio de novo spiritu* in PREGER, *G. d. d. Myst.* I., p. 461; DÖLLINGER, *Beitr.*, II. 365; cf. H. HAUPT, ZKG., VII. 556; the *statuta Henrici I.*, *archiep. Colon.* and the *statutum Johannis ep. Argentor.* in MOSHEIM, pp. 210 and 255; cf. DÖLLINGER, p. 397; Bull of Clement V. in *Clementinæ V.*, tit. 3, cap. 3; Ch. SCHMIDT, ZhTh. 1840; JUNDT, p. 426; WATTENBACH, in SBrA. 1887; PREGER, ABA. 1887, XVIII. 1.

How easily religious endeavours, produced by the ascetic impulses of the Church, could, when released from the fixed forms sanctioned by the Church, turn against the hierarchical Church itself, is shown by the history of the Beguine system. Its beginnings seem to lie in the exertions of the zealous Liègeois priest LAMBERT LE BEGUE (Beghe),¹ who about 1180 associated women and maidens for the purpose of leading a pious and chaste life. The societies which thence arose, without strict or perpetually binding vows, afforded needy women a secure home and opportunity for a pious and frugal life and works of mercy. From the middle of the twelfth century these societies spread in the form of the larger Beguine hostelries in the Netherlands, and in that of the smaller Beguine houses in German cities. Governed by mistresses, they in many cases stood under the supervision of guardians appointed by the communes, and under the spiritual influence of priests or monks, especially the mendicant friars. They enjoyed free lodging and other advantages from foundations and charitable gifts, and besides lived by the work of their hands, practised the care of the sick in private houses in return for small pay, and performed pious services, *e.g.* attendance on mass on certain days in accordance with the provisions of the foundations. The individuals in some cases kept houses of their own, in others they kept a common table (one God and one pot).

Of similar societies of men (Beguini, Beghardi) the oldest is found in the convent at Louvain about 1280. These associations of a semi-monastic character, therefore, fitted into the state of society in an assured manner. But the more general religious movement also sought in an unrestrained fashion after an expression for a life of ascetic form without monastic combination or ecclesiastical author-

¹ The derivation from a Liègeois priest seems to be certain; but it may be doubted whether the name is not to be explained similarly to that of the Lollards, viz., from the French word for "lisp" or "stammer"; but not from beg in the sense of pray or ask alms.

ization. In France we find Beguines of this sort (*boni valeti, boni pueri*), who, *e.g.*, enjoyed the favour of the Royal Family. The expression Beguini became a nickname (impostor, praying friar) for laymen, who busied themselves with special ecclesiastical devotion and "began to practise penance." This, therefore, was the same tendency out of which the so-called Tertiary Orders had been formed under the government of the mendicant friars. These Tertiaries are actually called Beguines, *e.g.*, by Bonaventura. This freer emergence of a style of devotion less protected by the Church involved the danger of a certain insubordination to the Church. They gave themselves up to a roaming style of life, held conventicles under no superior control, and begged "bread for God's sake" in the streets and villages, and thus sought to set forth the ideal of poverty in their own fashion. The unrestrained subjectivity of the religious life, combined with the social uprooting of many elements of the populace, led to serious unruliness. Beguines were threatened with excommunication if they did not obey the ordinary priest of their parish (Synod of Mayence, 1259 and 1261, of Magdeburg, 1261, can. 18). Thus, in these societies of a loose sort, there frequently arises a spirit of hostility to the Church: they set themselves in opposition to the clergy, and withdraw from confession and the sacraments.¹ The influence of the Franciscan Spirituals, with whom in Southern France the Beguines of both sexes are completely intermingled,² specially led to this anticlerical ultimate tendency; so likewise in the case of the so-called Apostles,³ who to the detriment of the papally recognised mendicant orders claimed support for their self-chosen devotion by begging. Finally, the **Brothers and Sisters of the Free Spirit** (Sect of the Spirit of Freedom or Sect of the New Spirit) find among them a fruitful soil for their visionary extravagances.

This tendency, arising out of the Amalricians (p. 426) had spread widely in Switzerland, South Germany, etc. Their pantheistic principles are gathered together in the *Compilatio de novo spiritu* ascribed to Albertus Magnus. The free spiritual man "forsakes God for God's sake," *i.e.* denies any supramundane nature of God, and with consciousness and will himself becomes God, does not recognise the specific Godhead of Christ, because every spiritual man is like Christ, and rejects the whole dogma and authority of the Church. The deified man is also free from the commandments of Christ; any ecclesiastical statute only hinders the good, *viz.* the spirit of sovereign divine freedom in man, who

¹ HEFELE (KNÖPFLE), VI. 130.

² DÖLLINGER, II. 518.

³ Reference is to be made to the Apostolicals of Segarelli, who arose out of the Franciscan movement itself, p. 421.

is above all sin, no longer requires any ecclesiastical mediation of salvation and acts out of inward divine freedom. Along with the transcendency of God and heavenly things, belief in judgment, hell, purgatory, and resurrection naturally fall away.

The views of this sect had arisen out of the theoretic speculation of men of higher culture, but yet were able to fill elements of the populace, which had grown doubtful of the Church and were socially uprooted, with radical fanaticism. In the free religious societies of the Beghards, these heretics persecuted by the Church, with their doctrine of hostility to the Church, found refuge and sympathy. Even here they gave the appearance of a higher sort of religious life, which carried away religiously excited and uneducated people. Hence, in the course of the thirteenth and far on into the fourteenth century, these tendencies appear so allied with the Beghards that they are actually designated by this name. They themselves take the name of *secta liberi spiritus et voluntarie paupertatis*, also *parvi fratres et sorores*, and it is intelligible how, with their religious radicalism, they were able to attain the semblance of a religious, higher perfection in the eyes of the multitude. Communistic ideas easily combine with the mystical pantheism of the deification and sublime perfection of the poor. The spiritually perfect has a right to the enjoyment of the good things of this earth without labour; thus, the ideal of poverty turns over into its opposite. Along with the heretical and visionary ideas of these Beghards, the material interests of the mendicant Orders also stir up feeling against them. On the Rhine the people seem to have preferred to give to the Beghards rather than to the mendicant friars. Beghards openly contradicted the sermons of the Minorites, and the latter, in 1308, called in the help of Duns Scotus, their famous scholastic chief, to defend them at Cologne. As early as 1306, Archbishop HENRY of Cologne adopted persecuting measures against the dangerous heretics, and in 1311, CLEMENT V., probably induced by the mendicant friars, issued a general condemnation of the Beguine system. In doing so Clement, without further comment, ascribed the errors of the sect of the Free Spirit to the free Beghards, but excepted the female Beguines, who led a penitential life in their houses, from the persecuting measures. The latter were also protected by John XXII., who judged them entirely as Tertiaries of the mendicant Orders. The so-called *Alexians*, *fratres cellitæ*, also called *Lollhards* by the people, who associated themselves in Antwerp soon after 1300 for works of mercy, bore a similar character to that of these Beghards, who were well disposed towards the Church. They also did

not entirely escape the suspicion of the Church and the persecutions of the Inquisition, which Gregory XI. sought to keep within limits.¹ And here, too, the name Beghards (Lollards, Sustriones) itself is used in a heretical sense and the churchly and piously living poor of this sort are only warned against being confounded with these heretics. Boniface IX. as late as 1394 took those who lived in accord with the Church under his protection, so far as they did not follow a rule reprobated by the Church.

¹ Bulls to the German and Netherland bishops, 1374-77.

CHAPTER SECOND.

The Time of the Western Schism and the Great Councils.

1. The Schism, the Reforming Councils of Pisa and Kostnitz and the Papacy till the Death of Martin V.

Sources: BARTH, PLATINA, *vitæ Pontif. Rom.*, Venet. 1479, Norimb. 1481 and frequently, especially the Dutch editions of 1640, 1645 and 1664, s. l. in 12; THEOD. DE NIEM, *de vita et factis Johannis XXIII.*, in MELBOM, *Scr. r. Germ.*, I. 5. The *vitæ* of all the popes in MURATORI, *Sc. r. Ital.* III., I. and II.; THEOD. DE NIEM (Niheim in Westphalia, Secretary to Gregory, XI., 1395–99 Bishop of Verden, died at Kostnitz in 1417), *de schismate inter papas et antipapas* and *Nemus unionis*, Basil. 1560 and frequently; the rest of the writings vindicated as his by LENZ (*drei Tractate*, Marb. 1876), as also many others, in the chief work; H. V. D. HARDT, *Magnum æcum. Concilium Const.*, Lips. 1700 sq. (where also the Acts of Pisa and Const.=MANSI XXVII.); THEODORICI VRIE, *de consolatione eccl. libri 4* (in V. D. HARDT I., I. as *hist. conc. Const.*); LEONARDI ARETINI, *rerum suo temp. in Ital. gest. comment.*, in MURATORI, *Scr. r. Ital.* XIX., 909.—*Literature:* DUPUYS, *hist. du schisme*, Par. 1654; LENFANT, *hist. du Conc. de Const.*, 2nd ed., Amst. 1727; BOURGEOIS DE CHASTENOT, *nouv. hist. du Conc. de Constance, ou l'on fait voir combien la France a contribué à l'extinction du Schisme*, Par. 1718; WESSENBERG, *d. grossen Kirchenversammlungen des 15. u. 16. Jh.*, Const. 1840 sqq.; RAUMER in the *hist. Tb.* 1849; R. HÜBLER, *die Constanzer Reformation u. die Concordate von 1418*; K. ZIMMERMANN, *die Kirchl. Verfassungskämpfe d. 15. Jh.*, Bresl. 1882; HEFELE VI. and VII.; LINDNER, *G. d. dtsh. R.'s vom Ende d. 14. Jh.*, I. 1 and 2, Braunsch. 1875–80.

THE return of Gregory XI. to Rome, which had become a wilderness, did not overcome the antagonistic interests. After his death, which shortly ensued, the Archbishop of Bari, Bartholomeo Prignano, was elected as URBAN VI. (1378–1389) by a compromise between the Italian and some of the French Cardinals (the so-called Limousin party). The Romans assailed the conclave with the demand for a Roman pope. To silence them the aged Cardinal Tibaldeschi was at first apparently elected, but after peace was established Urban was crowned. But, having no real adherents among the cardinals, Urban alienated men's minds by his ecclesiastical rigour and passionate severity. The French cardinals escaped, and being favoured by Charles V. of France, declared Urban's election to have been obtained by force, and, on the 20th September, 1378,

at Fondi, without the few Italian cardinals daring to protest, elevated the violent Cardinal Robert of Geneva as Clement VII. (1378-94). The momentous schism was complete, and the French king is said to have said: "Now am I pope."¹ Clement allured Duke Lewis of Anjou to combat his opponent, Urban, by the prospect of obtaining a large part of the State of the Church. The latter had on his side the weighty spiritual voices of the two Catherines, the dyer's daughter of Siena, a female Tertiary of the Dominicans, and the Swedish daughter of S. Birgitta of Sweden. In spite of the support of Queen Johanna of Naples, Clement was unable to maintain his position in Italy against the papal *Compagnia de San Giorgio* (Count Alberico), fled to France (Avignon), and was here also acknowledged by the University of Paris, further by Scotland, Savoy, Lorraine, and the Spanish kingdoms, while the Emperor Charles IV., with the greater part of the German empire, England, and the northern kingdoms, adhered to Urban, and in Italy, rent asunder as it was, at least central Italy, for the most part decided for him through the influence of Catherine of Siena. Urban bestowed the fief of Naples on Johanna's heir-apparent, Duke Charles of Durazzo (the nephew of King Lewis of Hungary, p. 447), took Johanna prisoner, and on the approach of Lewis of Anjou (the then Regent of France) prepared for her a bloody end. Lewis, indeed, died in 1384, but Urban now fell into conflict with Charles of Durazzo on account of Capua, and was besieged by him in a castle near Salerno. Having escaped to Genoa, the headstrong Pope caused five cardinals, who had fallen under his suspicion, to be executed. He refused to invest Ladislaus of Naples, the son of the just deceased Charles, with the fief, and the young Lewis II. of Anjou conquered Naples, so that the prospects of the French Pope grew. Then Urban died in 1389, and his successor, BONIFACE IX. (1389-1404) took the side of Ladislaus, established his authority in the State of the Church and in the restless Rome, but for that purpose he practised the art of money making, not less than his French opponent. His attempt to induce King Wenzel to undertake an advance on Rome in his interest came to wreck on the disturbances in the empire and in Wenzel's hereditary lands, and he was unable to attract King Charles VI. of France to his side.

The distress of the schism was felt with ever-increasing pressure. In 1394 the University of Paris caused numerous written opinions as to its abolition to be presented and submitted to the judgment of a commission. The resultant proposals were laid before the king

¹ StKr. 1873, 151.

by NICHOLAS OF CLEMANGES. The schism was to be abolished either *viâ cessionis* (by the abdication of both popes), or *viâ compromissi* (trial of claims by arbiters), or *viâ synodi* (a General Council), and the pope who should not submit to the decision was to be treated as a heretic. The King received the memorial of the University in a friendly manner, but, being brought round by the intrigues of Clement VII. and Cardinal Petrus de Luna, imposed silence on the University, which now threatened to suspend its lectures and preachings. After the death of Clement VII. (12th September, 1394), the election of the astute Aragonese, Petrus de Luna, as Pope BENEDICT XIII. (1394-1400), which ensued as early as 22nd September, rendered vain the exertions for the abolition of the schism. In spite of his promises of peace given before the election, he evaded all the efforts of the King, the University, and the French prelates, and finally declared that he would never resign. France and the majority of the French Cardinals at a General Synod (1398) then expressly renounced Benedict XIII., and a few other powers followed. Benedict became a prisoner in his palace at Avignon under the care of the Duke of Orleans.

On the other hand Richard of England and King Wenzel took up the French plan of overcoming the schism by the abdication of both popes. But Wenzel was shortly deposed himself (1400).¹ In France, where Benedict had the Duke of Orleans on his side, his imprisonment awakened new sympathy for him, and, in the University, GERSON and NICHOLAS of CLEMANGES raised a protest against the legality of the above-mentioned withdrawal of obedience. Besides, it was seen how the French crown was taking financial advantage of this period of interregnum. Benedict fled from Avignon, and in return for certain promises obtained the submission of France and of at least a part of the University to obedience to him. After the death of the Roman Pope, Boniface IX. (1st October, 1404), the intolerable state of affairs was prolonged by the elevation of INNOCENT VII. (1404-6). The latter, expert in affairs and a patron of science, in spite of all the promises he had given, was bound, by regard to King Ladislaus of Naples, who bridled the rebellious Romans for him, to go into negotiations for an agreement with his opponent only so far as Ladislaus' claims on Naples were kept guarded. A revolt in Rome, occasioned by the insolent action of a papal nephew, compelled Innocent to flee, and at the same time he made an enemy of Ladislaus. Benedict XIII. came to Italy under French protection, ostensibly for the purpose

¹ On the ambiguous conduct of Boniface IX. *vid.* HEFELE, VI. 734.

of negotiations with Innocent, really to utilize in his own favour the Roman revolt. But Innocent was again reconciled to the Romans and Ladislaus.

The French general synod of 1406 was again nearly at the point of withdrawing obedience from Benedict XIII. Then Innocent VII. died, and his Roman successor, GREGORY XII. (1406-9), again gave the most conciliatory assurances. On the basis of the stipulations of the Treaty of Marseilles a meeting of the two popes at Savona was to bring about peace. Benedict actually betook himself thither; Gregory, from Lucca, protracted the negotiations. His cardinals then abandoned him, and the French Church proclaimed obedience to Benedict. At the invitation of the French king, Germany, Hungary, and Bohemia issued declarations of neutrality. Benedict fled to Perpignan, and the cardinals of both sides in Leghorn summoned a General Council to Pisa for 1409.

The brilliant assembly met in March, 1409. Along with cardinals and prelates there appeared the abbots of various orders and numerous masters of theology and doctors of canon and Roman law, as well as the ambassadors of princes. Without attending to the protestation of the non-appearing popes, of Ruprecht of Germany, and Ladislaus of Naples, who still adhered to Gregory XII., the Council adopted the fundamental principle that **even without a pope it represented the universal Church**, and declared the two popes as schismatics and heretics to be *ipso facto* deposed. The cardinals were obliged to swear to take care that the Pope to be elected should be bound to carry through the reforms before the dismissal of the Council. But the Cardinal Archbishop of Milan, Petrus Filargio, who was now elevated as ALEXANDER V., after granting unimportant concessions, postponed the works of reform till a Council to be held after three years, and, as a weak instrument in the hands of the cardinals, continued the trade in benefices in the hitherto existing manner. Instead of two popes there were now three, for Naples, and other parts of Italy and Germany still adhered to Gregory XII., Spain and Scotland to Benedict. All hopes of reforms through the instrumentality of the Pope disappeared, when, on the death of Alexander (1410), the Cardinal Legate, Balthasar Cossa, who had already dominated Alexander, succeeded as JOHN XXIII., a man of rude force of character, crafty and daring, dissolute and ready for any crime. At the Council at Rome, which had been promised for 1412, there appeared but a few Italians, because no one trusted him. Hard pressed by Ladislaus of Naples, he was obliged to seek the protection of the Emperor Sigismund in

Upper Italy and could no longer evade his urgent pressure for a General Council. The latter was summoned, in accordance with the Emperor's wish, to the German city of **Kostnitz**. John actually appeared there in all pomp (October, 1414), the Emperor, with numerous princes and lords. In accordance with the general terms of the invitation there appeared not only prelates proper (bishops and mitred abbots), but numerous other ecclesiastical notables to whom the right of voting was conceded, especially a great crowd of masters and doctors of theology and canon law, also the ambassadors of princes and cities. By this circumstance, and by the new order of business (voting by nations not by heads), resistance was offered to the preponderance of the Italian votes. The decisive discussions were conducted in the separate assemblies of the nations, where princes and doctors exercised influence also, and the combined resolutions were published at the general sessions. The Council declared itself to be independent even in regard to the Council of Pisa, so as to be unhindered in the deposition of all three popes, even of John. Intimidated by a written accusation against him which was put in circulation, John declared himself ready to abdicate, but escaped from Kostnitz with the help of Frederick of Austria, and declared his concessions to have been forced and to be invalid. But the dissolution of the Council which was thus threatened was averted by the firmness of the Emperor and Gerson's powerful words. The assembly declared itself the legitimate representative of the universal Church, which even the Pope was bound to obey in matters of reform. The attempt to weaken the import of this resolution of the nations was rejected.¹ John was again imprisoned and given by the Emperor into the guardianship of the Palgrave Lewis. It was only subsequently, under Martin, that he was released for a ransom. Gregory XII. caused his ambassador, Malatesta, to announce his voluntary resignation in presence of the Council in a form in which it was subsequently possible to find the acknowledgment by the Council of his previous legitimacy. But Benedict XIII. finally tired out his own party; the Spaniards abandoned him and (October, 1416), as the fifth nation (alongside of Italy, Germany, France and England), entered the Council by which Benedict was deposed as a heretic in 1417.

¹ As to the authentic text of the relative decree of 16th March and 6th April, 1415, *vid.* J. FRIEDRICH, SBA. 1871. These resolutions form the chief stumbling-block of the later curialists, who, in opposition to the Gallicans, sought to limit the superiority of the Council over the Pope, then declared, to the then existing case of the schism.

He, however, maintained himself along with a few cardinals in the small mountain fortress of Peniscola in the province of Valencia.

At the Council, which from the end of the year 1417 was almost universally acknowledged, as early as the 17th April, 1415, it had been desired to exclude the cardinals from all discussions on union and reform. To anticipate this the cardinals themselves arranged the institution of a commission of their own for church reform (eight out of each nation and three cardinals). But the greatest difficulties soon showed themselves in the conflict of interests and the apprehension that, by shaking the hitherto existing foundations of the constitution of the Church, a complete ecclesiastical revolution would be hurried on. Hence the Emperor and the Germans, who at first were also supported by England, met with strong opposition to their demand that the reforms should be carried out before the election of a new pope. The French nation itself, which at first was the chief supporter of the ideas of reform, allied itself with Italy and Spain in favour of the priority of the election of the new pope.¹ Through the mediation of England a united resolution was come to, that the new Pope should be bound, before the dissolution of the Council, to carry out with the latter, or with the deputies of the nations, the reforms in regard to the head of the Church and the Roman Curia. The reformation *in membris*, i.e., the general programme of reform, was thus abandoned out of regard to the numerous private interests. The demands for reform were enumerated by name in eighteen articles. The Council then promulgated the few points already accepted by all the nations: the repeated holding of General Councils; the oath to be taken by the new Pope, especially at the General Councils; a regulation against the translation of prelates and against the so-called *jus spoli*. The Cardinal Legate OTTO COLONNA was then elected as MARTIN V. (11th November, 1417) by the cardinals and six votes out of each nation. The Pope, the first for a long period who was again universally acknowledged, swallowed, as it were, the authority of the Council. The rules of Chancery, which he issued in the traditional fashion, presupposed the continuance of the abuses which had been so emphatically combated, and in the new commission of reformation the conflicting interests asserted themselves as a hindrance. In the answer to the so-called Decree of Caution² Martin showed himself ready to make

¹ The University of Paris had a strong interest in the right of collation to benefices which was threatened by reform. Nor did the cardinals disdain bribery for the sake of breaking the resistance of the German nation.

² *Responsio* in v. D. HARDT, I. 1017; also in HÜBLER, 128.

certain concessions (limitation of the papal reservations and expectancies, the annates, servitia, and exemptions), but avoided entering upon other points of complaint, and expressly rejected the consideration of the thirteenth article, the question as to on account of what things and how the Pope could be punished and deposed. The Council now resolved to sanction the articles of the Decree of Caution so far as they had found agreement, and in regard to the rest to leave particular deviations to the individual nations. The former took place by the seven decrees of the 43rd session (21st March, 1417), the latter only by means of the Concordats after the close of the Council.

The German Concordat and the so-called French, which, however, according to the new attitude of parties also contains the settlement for Spain and Italy, were concluded on the 2nd May, 1418, the English on the 12th July. The content of these Concordats relates to the limitation of the number of the cardinals, their qualifications, and the share of the College of Cardinals in their nomination; further, to the limitation of the papal reservations by the recognition of the canonical right of election for cathedrals and abbey, and to the more exact demarcation of the claims of the Pope as against the rights of the ordinaries in appointment to benefices. Of all more important benefices of papal collation the Pope retained the annates at the level of half of the year's revenues, and the abolition of the exemptions of recent times from the jurisdiction was only attained under considerable limitations. In regard also to the abolition of the commendatory investitures, exceptions were made in favour of the revenues of the cardinals. The *dispensationes ab ordine*, which were so detrimental to the spiritual activity of the clergy, were abolished; those from the obligation of residence were at least limited (in the English Concordat) and several other provisions were made.

Even at the Council itself the Pope had declared appeals from the pope to a council and protests against him in matters of faith to be inadmissible, when the Poles, who had come in as a sixth nation, had in vain required of the Pope the condemnation of a rebellious treatise by the Dominican JOHANNES OF FALCKENBERG against their king, and (when Martin, out of regard to the Teutonic Order in Prussia, would not enter upon the matter) had appealed to the General Council. Finally, Martin, in contradiction of his concessions in the act of reform, granted the Emperor Sigismund an ecclesiastical title, confirmed the decisions of the Council, and dissolved it on the 22nd April, 1418. Accompanied by the Emperor Sigismund and the Elector of Brandenburg he left Kostnitz, where such bold ideas of reform had been buried by meagre concessions of a financial character which did not at all touch the real source of the corruptions. A *reformatio ecclesie in capite et membris* had been turned into a bargain about the interests of the national churches (the prelates and the secular power); and even the good intention, merely to carry out honourably what had been attained, was lacking. The old complaints of the monetary exactions of the Curia went on. In France and England the secular power sought to maintain its independent authority in ecclesiastical things. Hence France resisted the recognition of the Concordat; it was not till 1424 that the young King Charles gave way on this first point. The Council certainly left behind it the impression of an important shock to the papal system, but showed

itself entirely fruitless for the spiritual renewal of ecclesiastical life, as is shown above all by the fate of Hus (*vid. infra*). It did certainly take under its protection the cause of the Brothers of the Common Life against the attacks of the Mendicant Friars, and in the question of the murder of tyrants championed the morality of the Church.

Martin V., having returned to Italy, brought the State of the Church to order and submission, and did much for the utterly impoverished and degraded Rome, which, in greater peace and security, soon ceased to smart over the loss of its political independence. In so doing, Martin stood more than ever in need of financial resources, and practised nepotism in unlimited fashion in order to create a firm support in his family, the Colonnas. The promised council he summoned to Pavia in 1423, but before its beginning transferred it to Siena and soon dissolved it: a new council was to be held seven years later. The general desire for a council was further strengthened by the dangers which were threatened on the part of the Hussites. From England came the threat that the nation would itself take in hand ecclesiastical reforms. In France, the demand of the University became more pressing, and in Rome itself advertisements on the walls threatened the withdrawal of obedience in case of long delay. Martin then commanded Cardinal JULIUS CÆSARINI (the leader of the Hussite Crusade) to open and preside over a council, but at the same time gave him authority to dissolve or transfer it under certain circumstances. Soon thereafter Martin died (1431), of whom it may be said that he already founded the restoration of the spiritual and secular Papacy and buried the hope of reform.

2. The Aggravated Ecclesiastical Abuses under the Schism.

Sources: the tractate *de ruina ecclesie* in the works of Nicholas of Clemanges, ed. LYDIUS, 1613, and better in H. v. D. HARDT, *conc. Const.*, I., III. 1 sqq.; THEOD. DE NIMES, l.c. (especially, II. 7); MATTHEUS DE CRACOVIA, *de squaloribus Romanæ curiæ* in WALCH, *Monum. mediæ ævi*, I. 1; *Appellatio interposita per universit. Par. 6. Jan. 1406* in MARTÈNE ET DUR., *Thesaurus*, II. 1295; various official documents on the Council of Constance, such as the *declaratio* of the *natio gallicana de annatis non salvendis* in v. D. HARDT, I., XIII. 764.

The art of opening new sources to supply the needs of the Roman Curia and the avarice of ecclesiastical dignitaries, which the popes practised increasingly and with ever-growing recklessness at Avignon, reached its highest point among the rival popes of the Schism, who, in the limitation of the circle of their power, sought so much the more zealously to cover their deficits.

From the modest beginnings of the *preces et mandata de providendo* (p. 297), there had been developed the papal **Reservations** or **Provisions** on occasion of appointments to posts in the whole church. The power, already exercised by Innocent III., to dispose of benefices the holders of which died in Rome, had become a fixed right and was extended by Boniface VIII. But among all sorts of titles of right, the Avignonensian popes increased reservations of this character, especially Clement V., John XXII., and Clement VI., the last of whom was of opinion that his predecessors had not rightly understood how to be popes. The papal conferment of lucrative benefices took place from motives quite other than those of spiritual requirements and in open violation of canonical principles. Against the regulation of so-called incompatibility the benefices were **accumulated** in favoured hands. Even bishoprics and abbacies

were conferred in the form of **commend**s for a lifetime without obligation of personal exercise of office. The Council of Vienne, in 1311, already raised bitter complaints as to the accumulation of benefices, in consequence of which, really active priests were abandoned to poverty, although Clement V. had at one time taken a start to make an end of this nuisance.¹ Ecclesiastical order was thus gravely injured by the popes themselves in their own interest and frequently in that of the princes and especially of the French kings, on whom they were dependent. The papal money-tax continually increased in the fourteenth century for all possible business of the curia, dispensations, appeals, granting of privileges, etc. From all bishops, the ordination of whom had become a papal reserved right since the middle of the thirteenth century, the so-called **servitia cameræ papæ** or **servitia communia**, fixed at the level of a year's income, were demanded. From these the papal **annates** are further to be distinguished. After the analogy of the feudal relationship, the bishops, in the case of each vacancy of a benefice in their dioceses, had claimed the revenue of the first year as *jus deportuum*, *annalia*, *annata*, appealing to usage or special papal privileges. The popes themselves now required annates of this sort as *medii fructus* of the first year from all the (reserved) benefices, to collect which special *collectores frugum* were appointed. Under Benedict XIII. these annates are said to have brought in 200,000 francs yearly. The popes also caused the **gratiæ expectativæ** (conferment of the expectation of benefices to become vacant in the future) to be paid to themselves, exercised the odious *jus spoli* (p. 309) and delayed the filling up of vacant benefices for years in order to draw the so-called **vacantia**. In addition they finally practised to the detriment of the Church the proclamation of ecclesiastical **tithes**, partly for themselves, partly for secular princes. On the Roman side, even the rigorous Urban VI. could not escape the power of the system. But Boniface IX. discarded all consideration. He also bestowed the expectation of one and the same benefice on several candidates in return for immediate payment. In Rome it became a business to advance the requisite sums for usurious interest to place-seeking clergy. In this connection zealous curialists asserted that the Pope could never be guilty of simony.

Alongside of the trade in spiritual posts there grew the most shameless application of **indulgence**, which for these popes was a mere audacious financial speculation.

Outstanding schoolmen, such as Franciscus Mayron and Durandus a S. Portiano expressed the greatest scruples against this nuisance, but contented themselves with the usage sanctioned by the Church. Clement VI. founded on this the reduction of the **Jubilee Indulgence** from one hundred to fifty years.² Out of regard to the refractory Romans, Urban VI., in 1389, reduced the term to the thirty-third year, and Boniface IX., in 1390, recovered the term which had accordingly expired. The payment of the travelling money sufficed instead of a pilgrimage to Rome. To prolong it, in the succeeding years indulgence was granted for visiting particular towns (Cologne, Magdeburg). From the colossal sums paid for the jubilee indulgence some churches in Rome were restored, but most of the money flowed into the hands of the Pope to pay for his political enterprises and his buildings. Among the papal proclamations of indulgence there were some which granted indulgence from penalty and guilt,

¹ The Bull of 1307: *Extravagantes communes de præbendis*, cap. II.

² Bull: *Unigenitus*, of the 27th January, 1343.

and shameless traffickers in indulgences also pardoned all sins without penance for money. The commissioners enriched themselves, but had frequently to disgorge their fraudulent gains and atone in imprisonment. The trade was most shamelessly pursued by Balthasar Cossa (afterwards John XXIII.). Resistance to the abuse was threatened as heresy and hostility to the apostolic See and reduced to silence. After reaping a rich harvest, Boniface IX. sought to screen himself by retracting the indulgences granted as surreptitiously obtained or extorted from the papal mercy. The opportunities of gaining daily indulgence increased; these were bestowed for repetition of the Ave Mary and for accompanying the Sacrament to the sick. Accordingly the fines at the episcopal synodal courts became sources of money for the bishops and their officials. In many places the chosen synodal witnesses became paid informers (*exploratores, promotores*), who snatched at accusations, so that the persons concerned might ransom themselves.

To the abuses which proceeded from the papal Curia there corresponds naturally the increase of general ecclesiastical corruption. The extraordinary prevalence of exemptions of churches, monasteries, chapters, etc., undermined ecclesiastical order and discipline, and degraded the spiritual authority of the bishops, whose entanglement in a multitude of earthly affairs of law and controversies likewise stifled their spiritual office. The example of the Papal Court strengthened the entire secular attitude of the hierarchy, which sees nothing in the spiritual office but the rich living, and in its opulence is separated by a deep gulf from the for the main part oppressed condition of the parochial clergy,¹ who, on the average, like a large part of the monks, sank into ignorance, rudeness and meanness. The old curse of the **enforced celibacy** of the clergy produced its poisonous fruits, and the synods mostly confined themselves to measures against open concubinage, which, however, afforded the best means of protection, where, as in Norway and Ireland, it had become a universally recognised, socially respected alliance, as in the Pyrenæan peninsula, where it was entered into under promise of indissolubility.² The few priests who really kept themselves chaste were derided or laid under base suspicions. The laity regard the concubinage of the priests as a security for their wives and daughters. According to Æneas Silvius, the Frisians would admit no celibate priests. The fines imposed on *concubinarii publici* were regarded as payment whereby the pastors purchased toleration, and became sources of income to the bishops.

The relation of the secular to the ecclesiastical powers is essentially altered (*vid. supra*, chap. I. 4, p. 460). In Germany, in the con-

¹ Therein Nicolaus Oresimus of Rouen, in a sermon preached before Urban V. in 1363, sees a sure sign of the near ruin of the Church.

² *Id.* Synod of Valladolid in 1322, which interdicts it ecclesiastically.

hlict of Lewis the Bavarian with the Curia, the electors at least attain the security of their right of election, and in the **Golden Bull** of CHARLES IV. a result is reached which is of politico-legal importance. In France the policy of the kings, changing according to the interests of the Church, favours national emancipation. In Italy, amid the political party conflicts, the civic republics and tyrannies only reckon with the spiritual claims as factors in secular power, and in England the national feeling rises successfully against papal interferences. The schism makes the Papacy, divided against itself, to a great extent dependent on the good-will of the secular rulers and so inclined to all sorts of concessions. The conflict against the interference of the spiritual jurisdiction in secular order shows itself most decidedly everywhere. In Italy it is often violently disregarded, in Switzerland the Parsons' Letter of 1370 puts an end to clerical assumptions, in Germany the lively spirit of independence in the cities combats, often successfully, against the encroachments of the clergy, and even the prelates in their position as secular landlords recognise that secular affairs are the business of the secular court only. In France the spiritual jurisdiction, which just here is specially extensive, leads to constant friction between barons and prelates. By conferring the tonsure, many laymen, even married men, were made clergy, in order to withdraw them from secular jurisdiction. Under Philip of Valois negotiations were conducted in 1329 between barons and prelates on the thwarting of the secular jurisdiction by the growing spiritual claims.¹ But the King, induced by political considerations, contented himself with some assurances of the bishops, and the provincial synods held fast to the spiritual jurisdiction and defended it with the spiritual weapon of excommunication.

But the tendency of the age more and more took the side of secular interests and found a powerful support in the **Parliament of Paris**. This latter, now permanently sitting, superior tribunal for the old royal crown domain, into which Philip in 1319 had refused entrance to the prelates, obtained a powerful influence especially under Charles V., prevented the encroachments of the spiritual jurisdiction and claimed the right to decide in all matters of secular property. In Germany it was especially the cities which opposed and limited by all sorts of measures the excessive increase of spiritual property.

¹ *Actio Petri de Cygneriis et Petri Bertrandi de jurisdictione ecclesie*, in GOLDAST, *Monarchia*, II. 1361 (also in *Bibl. max. Lugd.*, XXVI. 165).

3. John Wiclif.¹

Sources: HENRICI DE KNYGHTON (a contemporary), *de eventibus Angliæ usque ad a 1395* in ROG. TWISDENI *script. X. hist. Angl.*, London 1652 sqq.; THOM. WALSHINGHAM (about 1440), *hist. Anglica major*; in CAMDENI *script. rer. Angl.*, Lond. 1574, Frankf. 1692; W.'s writings, *Triologus* (ed. pr. 1525), ed. LECHLER, Oxf. 1869; FORTHAL and MADDEN, *The holy Bible in the earliest English versions*, Oxf. 1850 sqq., 4 vols. and thereof the N.T. ed. by W. W. SKEAT, Oxf. 1879 (already edited by LEWIS in 1731). Some English treatises in J. H. TODD, *Three treatises*, Dubl. 1851; TH. ARNOLD, *Select English works of J. W.*, Oxf. 1869-71; MATTHEW, *English works of J. W. hitherto unprinted*, London 1880 (Early English Text Society); LECHLER in the *Life of W.*, II. 574-621, and in a *Universitäts-progr.*, Lpz. 1863; R. BUDDENSIEG, *W. de Christo et adversario suo anti-christo*, Gotha 1880; W. W. SHIRLEY, *fasciculi zizaniorum mag. J. W.*, Lond. 1865 (SrBr.); R. BUDDENSIEG, *Polemical works of J. W. in Latin*, 2 vols., 1883 (by commission of the Wyclif Society), and simultaneously *J. W.'s lateinische Streitschriften*, Lpzg. 1883. Among the further publications of the Wyclif Society especially, *De civili domino* by REG. LANE POOLE, 1885, *De ecclesia* by LOSERTH, 1886, and the 3 vols. of *sermones* by the same, 1887-89. Cf. ZKG., IX. 523 sqq.—*Literature:* along with the older works of J. LEWIS (1720) and R. VAUGHAN (1828, 1831 and again in 1853), *vid.* specially SHIRLEY l. c. and V. G. LECHLER, *J. c. W.*, Lpz. 1873, 2 vols.; MONTAGU BURROW, *W.'s place in history*, Lond. 1882; LOSERTH, *Hus and W.*, Prag u. Lpz. 1884, and R. BUDDENSIEG, *J. W. u. s. Zeit*, Halle 1885.

In the agitated life of the English nation of the fourteenth century, full of warlike successes and growing prosperity, the national feeling arose against the avarice and assumption of the Avignonian Papacy, which besides was dependent on France, the national enemy.

In 1343 Edward III. decidedly vindicated the rights of the crown as the highest court of appeal in civil and criminal matters, even against the Church, and also his jurisdiction in matters of the patronage of English benefices, sharply opposed with the support of Parliament the monetary exactions of the Roman Curia, especially the papal reservations and provisions, and made the intercourse of the Curia with the English clergy conditional on special consent. As he regarded the free election by the chapter as a concession by the crown afforded by renouncing the royal nomination of bishops, which was nullified by the interference of the papal provisions, he ordained in the **Statute of provisors of benefices** of 1350, that in every case in which the Pope attempted to confer office the King had the right of filling up the post; every attempt of a pretender nominated by the Pope to enter into enjoyment of the emoluments, either personally or by commissioners, is punished with arrest until satisfaction be offered and solemn renunciation of all claims. With this end the **Statute of præmunire**² of 1363 prohibited the carrying of matters that belonged to the

¹ On the spelling of the name *vid.* LECHLER, I. 267, note, and BUDDENSIEG, p. 92.

² The word arose out of a corruption of *præmonere*.

royal jurisdiction before a foreign tribunal and appeal from the former to the latter. The anti-ecclesiastical temper of the nation directed itself against the secularisation of the Church generally, and particularly against the Mendicant Friars, who were so greatly favoured by Rome and who had been at one time received as the people's poor preachers with great reverence, but now asserted an oppressive preponderance. Archbishop RICHARD (Fitz-Ralf) of Armagh raised his voice against the moral value of mendicancy, the encroachments of the Mendicant Friars on the parochial pastorate and their excessive growth, and on account of his attacks was obliged to defend himself before Innocent VI. at Avignon, where he died. But among the people, their avarice and the manner in which they took advantage of pious superstition, even the meanness and luffoonery of many of them, excited derision and hatred. Under the grave social oppression of the populace, especially of the fleeced peasantry, which forms the dark side of the otherwise brilliant and joyful life of the time of Edward III., a sense of the suffering of the people and its profound state of religious neglect makes itself keenly felt and turns against the secularisation of the Church and its alienation from its proper spiritual duties. This finds a popular expression of far-reaching effect in the poem, "*The Vision of Piers Ploughman*,"¹ ascribed to a priest or monk named LANGLAND. To the joyous delight of a jocund age in Chaucer's Canterbury Tales are contrasted melancholy complaints of the corruption which pervades all classes, and which is most strongly scourged among priests and monks. The poor husbandman, engaged in homely toil and living in the fear of God, hopes for relief from a King who will chastise them.

The circumstances touched upon afforded a fertile soil for the reforming efforts of a man who starts from the national ecclesiastico-political complaints of his people, passes on to the religious needs of the people who were neglected by the Church, and rises into conflict with the principles of the system of the Roman Church.

JOHN WICLIF, of an old Anglo-Saxon noble family in Yorkshire, was born about 1324 in or near the village of Wycliffe,² which belonged to his family, and was educated scholastically at Oxford. In 1360 he became president (Master of the Hall) of Balliol College, and in 1365 was made by Bishop Islep of Canterbury the head of the College of Canterbury Hall founded by him. But Islep's successor, SIMON LANGHAM, filled the college with monks, against which Wiclif maintained his own rights and those of the University in a legal case of years' duration, which he lost in 1370. Meanwhile Wiclif defended the crown against URBAN V., who in vain demanded the feudal tax to the Pope which Edward refused for many years. Edward's great need of money led to continuous demands in the Parliament, but at the same time to heavy burdening of church property and the clergy. The anti-clerical spirit among the Lords

¹ *The Vision of Pierce Ploughman*, ed. Wright, London 1856; cf. LECHLER, *J. W.*, I. 244 sqq.

² Thus spelt at the present day.

and Commons brought about in 1372 the deposition of the prelates from the highest offices of State and the substitution of laymen. The appearance of a papal agent, ARNOLD GARNIER, who in the next succeeding years worked as receiver of papal revenues in England, excited the temper of the people.¹ At the Congress at Bruges in 1374-75, where, with the co-operation of the Pope, England (the Duke of Lancaster) negotiated with France, the ecclesiastical complaints against the Curia were also discussed by a commission to which Wiclif belonged. GREGORY XI. made some concessions, but skilfully avoided all decisions binding for the future, so that the Parliament of 1376 renewed the old complaints of Roman exactions. Wiclif, who was already in possession of some benefices, and who had been made parson of Lutterworth (in the county of Leicester) by the Crown in 1374, had not hitherto been attacked as to his orthodoxy. Now, however, COURTENAY, the Bishop of London, called Wiclif to account before the Convocation of clergy (1377), at a time when the nobles had drawn nearer to the prelates in opposition to the selfish and ambitious plans of the Duke of Lancaster. In Wiclif, the Duke's *protégé*, a blow was to be struck at the Duke himself. Wiclif appeared in S. Paul's, accompanied by the Duke of Lancaster; the populace of London took sides against the imperious Duke, and excesses took place in the church. The widow of the Prince of Wales, Johanna, the mother of Richard, the heir-apparent, interfered as mediatrix. An accusation which was presented against Wiclif² had the effect that Gregory XI., who had just returned from Avignon to Rome, commissioned the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London with the examination and eventual arrest of Wiclif, called upon the King and the University of Oxford to protect orthodoxy, and designated Wiclif a heretic, who approached the false doctrines of Marsilius of Padua (Bull of 23rd May, 1377). But after Edward's death the first Parliament under the infant Richard II. exhibited a very excited temper against the Roman exactions, and Wiclif gave the opinion that the King of England, in case of need, might legitimately withhold the treasure of the kingdom, even when the Pope demanded the exportation of the money under threat of ecclesiastical penalties. According to S. Bernard, he said, the duty of the priesthood was not to rule, but to serve and help. The fathers had endowed the Church for the support of its clergy, and not to aggrandise the power of the

¹ *Vid.* LECHLER, II., Appendix B, 2.

² *Vid.* the nineteen articles in WALSINGHAM, ed. RIDLEY, I. 353; also in SHIRLEY, *fascic.* and frequently.

Roman Pope. It was only after the prorogation of Parliament (in the end of December, 1377) that Archbishop SUDBURY of Canterbury commissioned the University of Oxford to determine whether Wiclif had really taught the principles ascribed to him. Wiclif submitted himself in the spring to a clerical judicial examination in Lambeth Palace, and presented a written defence; the citizens of London, with great energy, and the Queen, through the Knight Clifford, interceded in Wiclif's favour, and the assembly contented itself with forbidding him to proclaim these principles in lectures and sermons, because they gave offence to the laity. Shortly thereafter Gregory XI. died, and the schism broke out.

Up to this point in Wiclif's efforts the national interest of resistance to the claims of Rome stood in the foreground. But, as a matter of fact, they already amounted to radical opposition to the idea of a spiritual compulsory power in general. Not *dominium*, but *ministerium* is the business of the priesthood. Not the possession of dominion, but the alms of believers are assigned to the clergy. The power to dispose of secular property, even that which has been bestowed on the Church, is the attribute of the secular power, which, in case of misuse, can withdraw it from the Church, and the Church has no right to extort the temporalities by the use of spiritual penalties. The Pope's power of the keys is different in no respect from that of any ordinary priest, and is conditioned by God's law and will. He binds and looses only in so far as he conforms to the law of Christ. No man can be excommunicated, because he has already excommunicated himself. The ideal background for his views on spiritual and secular power is formed by the ideas of property and dominion developed in the treatise *De dominio divino*. All authority, all property, and all dominion rest upon grace alone. God is the liege-lord who confers the property on those who are obedient to Him. There is no unconditional and eternal heritage of secular dominion, no human title to possession can secure such; only he who stands in grace is the true lord; mortal sin disqualifies the sinner from administering God's fief: *peccans mortaliter non habet dominium*. With this deeper reaching principle, to which Wiclif only concedes ideal value, the idea of the specific priesthood is already broken down. A priest, even the Pope, may legally be punished and accused by the laity under him.

Wiclif at first still placed hopes in the serious churchly disposition of Urban VI., but soon undeceived, he regarded both Popes as apostates and members of anti-Christ, thanked God who had split the head of the serpent in two and made the one half fight against

the other, and summoned the secular power to take advantage of the present time for the reformation of the Church. He issued numerous pamphlets, in Latin and German, and sent out pious men, incited by himself, as "poor priests" (without vows or formal consecration), who, hated by prelates and rich parish priests, and often mocked at in the cities, were hailed with welcome by the people with their simple proclamation of the law of God, and called forth great agitation. They were to be what the Mendicant Orders might have been and become, and what according to their nature as such all clergy ought to be, **poor, unpropertied heralds of the Gospel**. But the Mendicant Orders had rather become a real cancer in the Church. Against them in late years Wiclif opened an indefatigable conflict. In his Latin controversial writings¹ he completes the breach with the idea of the Church and his idea of the Christian community or common Christendom. While dogmatically conceived, the Church is the whole body of the predestinated, Christendom, or the **secta Christi**, considered empirically, and as an ecclesiastical polity, expands into the *multitudo nominum unum patrum (Christum) sequentium, unum regulam (lex Christi) admittentium*. All *sectæ privatae*, with their claims to special religious value, are arbitrary and without scriptural foundation, and become decomposing forces for the one and universal sect of Christ. As such a private sect he regards the *clerus Cæsarius*, i.e. the hierarchy of the prelates and the regular clergy endowed and equipped with rights of dominion; further, the older endowed monastic Orders; finally, also the Mendicant Friars who defend the heresy of the prelates and lords (dominion and exercise of force), to be defended by them in turn. In the **one** Christendom there are indeed alongside of the true Christians very many also who are Christians in name, and in individual cases it is not possible to prove to demonstration who belongs to the one and who to the other party; but where Christ is adhered to as the sole patron, God's law acknowledged as the sole rule, and men live quietly in the faith of the Lord Jesus, we may be confident that the *secta Christi* exists. Over against the false sects stands the authorized distinction of the **classes** recognised by the Lord, the clergy, the *milites* (lords) and the *vulgares*, whose duty it is mutually to serve one another.

Wiclif's increasingly exclusive resort to **Scripture** now occasions the great work of the **translation of the Bible** (according to the Vulgate) into English, which in the course of its development had just then become a uniformly perfected literary language, by whose

¹ In BUDDENSIEG, 1-536.

cradle stand the poet Chaucer and the prose writer Wiclif. With the help of some disciples, especially NICHOLAS of Herford, who translated the greater part of the Old Testament, Wiclif took charge of the New Testament, and PURVEY, another disciple, conducted the revision.

In the conflict against Roman doctrines (on penance, indulgence, etc.) special notice was excited by his decided controversion of the scholastic **doctrine of Transubstantiation**. His twelve *conclusiones* made even his patron Lancaster anxious, but his *confessio*¹ of the 13th May, 1381, retracted nothing essential.

It was sought to make Wiclif's ideas responsible for the frightful Peasants' War (Wat Tyler) which broke out in the summer of 1381, during which the King and Court in London were in danger, and the Archbishop of Canterbury and others were murdered. After the suppression of the revolt, COURTENAY, now made Archbishop of Canterbury, caused a series of Wiclif's propositions to be rejected at a synod in London (the Earthquake Synod), but without mentioning him by name. Measures were adopted for the suppression of the heresy in Oxford, and the prosecution of the Poor Priests. A law, which the **secular authority** placed at the service of the Church for the prosecution of the heretics, was wrecked on the opposition of the House of Commons, but was replaced by the King by a patent (20th June, 1382), which gave the Archbishop and his bishops full power to arrest the heretical preachers. Wiclif and his closest companions in opinion were obliged to leave Oxford, some of the latter were laid under the ban by the bishop, and the party of the monks in Oxford gained influence there. Wiclif himself remained unattacked in his parish at Lutterworth, whither he had retired, and seems to have defended himself in person at a Provincial Synod in Oxford (November, 1382), while he also presented an address to the King and the Parliament which was just assembling.² The disposition of Parliament, which was angry at the dominion of the bishops which was favoured by the King, probably explains his security.

In his latest years Wiclif developed an extraordinary wealth of literary production. Sermons and treatises in the vernacular were useful in teaching Scripture and in edification, but also in controversy. In the *Trialogus* he developed his theology with its philosophico-scholastic pre-suppositions, while he gradually attained greater clearness and scriptural depth. When Urban VI. caused the Mendicant Friars in England to preach the crusade against the adherents

¹ Shirley, *Fasc.*, p. 115 sqq.

² *Vid.* Th. ARNOLD, *Select works of J. W.*, III. 507.

of the anti-pope Clement in Flanders (the so-called Clementines), which was undertaken by the warlike Bishop Spencer in the spring of 1383, Wiclif rose in his controversial writings *Cruciata* and *De Christo et adversario suo Anti-christo*, to the most incisive opposition on principle to the Papacy as anti-Christendom. He was cited to Rome by Pope Urban, but evaded the summons on the ground of a prohibition of the King's. On the 28th December, 1384, while hearing mass in the church at Lutterworth, he was attacked by apoplexy, and died on December 31st.

Wiclif left behind him numerous zealous adherents, scholars at the University of Oxford, and many laymen won by the travelling preachers. The preachers and their adherents among the populace had already in late years been designated by their opponents as heretical praying-brothers under the name of Lollards (Lollhards), which had arisen in the Netherlands since the beginning of the fourteenth century, and had the same meaning as Beghards.¹ Under the protection of powerful lords the travelling preachers held assemblies and smaller conventicles, and tractates appeared in the vernacular, which set up the Bible as the sole authority against the Pope and hierarchy, acknowledged the right of every layman to preach the Gospel, denied godless priests the right to the ecclesiastical tithes and even the capacity to administer the sacraments and hear confession, and in general combated the manipulation of confession by the priests. Evangelical views led individuals, *e.g.* WALTER BRUTE, to more decided accentuation of justification by faith alone than is found in Wiclif himself. But alongside of this there is a radical spiritualism of a Donatist character and a practical agitation, which at the same time forms these Lollards into an ecclesiastico-political party, which *e.g.* in 1395 called upon the Parliament to undertake thorough-going ecclesiastical reforms in Wiclif's sense. Popular poems which follow the type of the Vision of the Plowman worked in the same direction.² Steps taken by the hierarchy against Wiclif's doctrine and its authority in Oxford (Provincial Synod of Canterbury under Th. Arundel, 1397) remained at first of little effect. But when Richard II. had been overthrown by a hierarchical and aristocratic conspiracy, and the house of LANCASTER had been raised to the throne in the person of Henry IV., this son of the Lancaster who had been so favourable to Wiclif, based his youthful power on the bishops, and placed the state's compulsory power against the Lollards at their disposal. In the **Act of Parliament de comburendo hæretico** of 1400, capital punishment was decreed against heretics for the first time in English legislation, and in accordance with it many proceedings were taken. One of Wiclif's most intimate associates, John Purvey (Purney), agreed to recant, while laymen of low estate suffered martyrdom.³ A declaration of the Chancellor and many masters of Oxford on the 5th October, 1406, took Wiclif's memory under protection as that of a brave athlete of the faith, who had only opposed the blasphemies of some

¹ *Id.* the passages in LECHLER, *J. W.*, II. 4 sqq., and in addition DÜLLINGER, *Beiträge*, II. 382, 407; cf. *supra*, p. 475.

² LECHLER, II. 35 sqq.

³ W. Thorpe's narratives of his trial before Archbishop Arundel in 1409 still formed favourite reading at the time of the Reformation; *vid.* J. FOXE, *Acts and Monuments*, ed. TOWNSEND, Lond. 1843, III. 250.

Mendicant Friars.¹ But the former clerical and monastic minority obtained decisive power, as early as 1412, by continued measures of intimidation. They laid 267 propositions out of Wiclif's writings before the Archbishop, and demanded their condemnation. The number of noble patrons of Wiclif and the Lollards now also speedily diminished. The fate of JOHN OLDECASTLE, the "good Lord Cobham," made a deep impression. Arrested as a heretic as early as 1413, but having escaped, he was regarded as the alleged founder of a Lollard conspiracy, and under accusation of high treason, was again seized in 1417; steadfast under Henry V.'s attempts still to gain him over, he was hanged in chains between two gallows, and slowly burned by fire placed below. The action of the statute of 1400 was strengthened by a royal statute of 1414, which bound all officers of the state on oath to assist the bishops in suppressing the heresy. All property of condemned heretics was confiscated.

4. Reforming Movements in Bohemia before Hus.

Sources: On the Synod of Prague of 1349, *vid.* MANSI, XXVI. 75 sqq., and 382 sqq.; CONST. HÖFFLER, *Concilia Pragensia* (1352-1413) in ABG. n. F. 12, Prag 1862; W. TOMEK, *G. d. Prager Univ.*, Prag 1864; the *Responsio* of K. WALDHAUSER in HÖFFLER, *Geschichtsschr. d. hus. Bewegung*, II. 22, other material in MENZIK, *Konr. Waldhauser*, Prag 1884; the 12 Articles of Milicz in JORDAN (properly Palacky), *die Vorläufer des Husitentums in Böhmen*, Lpz. 1846, pp. 39-46; MATTH. V. JANOW'S, *regulæ vet. et novi test.*, in great part in Hus *opp.*, Nürnberg. 1558.—*Literature:* PALACKY, *Gesch. Böhmens* III., 1; FRIND, *KG. Böhmens* III.; JORDAN, l.c.; NEANDER, *K.G.*, VI. 330 sqq. of the 1st ed.; KRUMMEL, *G. d. böhm. Reform im 15 Jh.*, Gotha 1866; LECHLER, *J. W.*, II.

Not only did the sects, especially the Waldensians, loosen the soil in Bohemia, but also the reign of Charles IV., which was of great importance in many aspects, contained the elements of a rise in the condition of the Church. Charles showed his favour to the Church by rich endowments, but also sought to check ecclesiastical encroachments and the secularisation of the clergy. Endowed both by him and by the Church, the University of Prague came into being in 1348, and opened the series of new foundations in the Empire (Vienna 1365, Heidelberg 1386, Cologne 1388, Erfurt 1392). The bishopric of Prague, which had hitherto been under Mayence, was raised in 1344 into an archbishopric, to which Olmütz and Leitmeritz were subordinated. The first Archbishop EARNEST (Arnest) of PAR-DUBITZ, worked in an outstanding manner for ecclesiastical order and security from the arbitrary management of the nobility, the discipline of the clergy and popular instruction in the vernacular (Synod of Prague 1349). The Czech language, which had hitherto served only for the epic national poetry, was now opened to ecclesiastical culture. Thomas of **Stibny**, who translated ecclesiastical and theological subjects into the vernacular, was in close alliance with

¹ The document was regarded in Bohemia and Kostnitz as a forgery of the Hussites, but certainly originated in Oxford.

the very influential men who were ardent for the revival of the Church.

CONRAD, a native of Waldhausen in Upper Austria, a priest among the regular canons of S. Augustine, was called by Charles IV. as a highly esteemed preacher, and received the benefice of Leitmeritz and in 1364 the chief pastoral office in the *Teyn Kirche* in Prague. His sermons on penance, delivered in German, had an awakening effect, but at the same time drew down on him the attacks of the Mendicant Friars, whose soul-ensnaring ways, legacy-hunting, and huckstering methods he scourged. He also preached before the students. He died in 1369. The Czech MILICZ, from Kremsier in Moravia, Archdeacon and Canon in the cathedral in the Hradschin, and at the same time secretary and sub-chancellor to Charles, resigned all his revenues and offices in 1363 to preach the gospel in poverty and humility; he worked for a year and a half as chaplain to the parish priest of the small town of Bischofsteinig in Western Bohemia. He then preached, at first little noticed, with growing success in the Czech language in Prague, and at the same time in Latin, before scholars and students, and further, learned German in his old age. He exercised great pastoral influence over the female sex; he founded a Magdalen institution for converted prostitutes in "little Venice" (Benatky) the most notorious quarter of Prague, as Bishop John of Druzic¹) had done before him. Both his zeal against the universal secularism and the apocalyptical expectations which were combined with it, exhibit the influence of strict Franciscanism. In the midst of his work as a preacher in Prague and in the district of Olmütz, he was once on the point of retiring wholly into strict monasticism. To him the corrupt clergy and monks (incumbents and *simoniaci*), who deprive the poor members of Christ, of their own, are the Anti-Christ, and pious preachers of the gospel are the angels, who precede the coming Lord. In Rome, where, in 1367, he was patiently awaiting Urban's return from Avignon, he was arrested by an inquisitor, when he publicly announced sermons on the appearance of Anti-Christ as having already taken place. But Urban released him from prison, in which he had already written a treatise on Anti-Christ. In Prague he became the successor of Conrad of Waldhausen, preached in German, and gathered about him a free association of younger clergy, who were soon reviled as Militschians or Beghards. He evaded an investigation by the inquisitor of Prague, who was commissioned by the Pope, and went in person to Avignon, where, however, he died before the issue of a decision (1374).

¹ *Vid.* PALACKY, III. 1, 195.

His zealous admirer, MATTHIAS of Janow (called *Magister Parisiensis* after his studies there), canon in the cathedral from 1381, wrought more through the confessional and the pastoral office than by preaching. Under the Schism, his ideas of reform ripened to the extent of breaking up the conception of the Roman Church. The schism, arising out of self-seeking and not out of the love of Christ, cannot harm the one Church of the saints and elect, but only reveals those who were merely Christians in appearance. The idea of a universal priesthood of believers, the little flock which follows the crucified, develops into a very far-reaching repudiation of ceremonies as commandments of men, especially the adoration of the saints and the worship of images. The Bible is his constant companion. Frequent participation in the sacrament, which had been already recommended by Milicz, becomes for him the best Christian food for humble Christians, conscious of their unworthiness. Where possible he would have daily communion and laments the resolution of the Synod of Prague (1388), which would permit it once a month at most. At the Synod of Prague of 1389 he recanted objectionable expressions on the adoration of images, and also on daily communion. The Synod deprived him for six months of authority to preach and hear confession outside his parish church. He seems to have felt more and more deeply the contradiction between his convictions, recorded in the above-mentioned compilation, and the existing Church. "It only remains for us to wish for reformation by the destruction of Anti-Christ himself and to raise our heads because the redemption is nigh."

A certain Magister JACOBUS was obliged, at the same Synod of Prague, as Matthias, to recant his utterances on the merit of the Virgin, on useless intercessions for the dead, on the right of the laity to receive the body of the Lord itself from the hands of the priest and on his contempt for relics.

5. The Brothers of the Common Life.

Sources: The biographies of the founders and their next adherents in Thomas a Kempis, *opp.* ed. SOMMALI, Antw. 1607; JOH. BUSCH, *Chronicon canon. regul. ord. Aug. capit. Windeshemensis*, ed. H. ROSWEYDUS, Antw. 1621, and ed. GRUBE, Halle 1886; much other material in HIRSCHÉ, R.E., II. 678 sqq.—*Literature*: G. H. DELPRAT, *Verhandeling ober de Braderschap van G. Groote*, Utrecht 1830, 2nd ed. Arnheim 1856; the first edition translated by MONKE 1830; Th. A. CLARISSE in *Kist en Royaards Archif vor Kerk. Gesch.*, I. 355; II. 245; III., *Bilagen* 8, 3; ULMANN, *Ref. v. d. Ref.*, 2nd ed. 1866, II. 1 sqq.; HIRSCHÉ l.c.; ACQUOY, *het Kloster te Windesheim*, etc., Utrecht 1875-80.

In the midst of the conflicts of the secular Papacy at the time of the Schism the spiritual influence on the cultivation of inward

religious life, which had proceeded from ascetic mysticism, was continued. GERARD GROOT, of Deventer, born in 1340, gave up his property and benefices in 1374, founded a home for God-fearing poor and lived himself in poverty and austerity, but kept up his studies. JOHN RUYSBROEK's devoted tranquillity and love of God exercised the deepest influence on Groot, who only at first regrets the absence of a keener fear of hell in Ruysbroek. After a residence in a Carthusian monastery near Arnheim, he formed his foundation at Deventer into an asylum for poorer women, maidens, and widows, who retained the civil garb, bound themselves to obedience and chastity (but without taking the vow of any Order), and earned their maintenance by working with their hands. Groot wrought as a zealous preacher of penance in the monastery of Utrecht and the neighbouring districts, exhorted to scorn of the world, rebuked the sins of the laity and the clergy, and combated the Free Spirits who presumed to force their way into the depths of Deity without self-denial, till opponents procured an episcopal prohibition of his preaching because he was only a deacon. A young canon of Utrecht, FLORENTIUS RADEWINS (*i.e.* Radewin's son), attached himself cordially to him, and the young clerics led by him, and, occupied with copying books, formed a close community, to which laymen active in manual work were soon added. Thus arose the first **Fraterhouse**, while Groot's foundation developed into the first **Sisterhouse**. Here in distinction from the earlier houses of Beguines, community of goods and a more monastic life prevailed. They kept clear of mendicancy, on principle, by the obligation to work. The Mendicant Friars at once attacked this new phenomenon, appealing to the Bull of Clement V. (p. 477), and compelled Groot to defend himself. Groot's religious attitude is throughout that of a good churchman, and is dominated by monastic ideals, but intensified by warm love of his neighbour and mystical contemplation. He died of the plague as early as 1384, in consequence of a visit to a sick friend.

After his death, in accordance with an idea which Groot had already conceived, Florentius, in 1387, brought about the foundation of a monastery of the regular canons of S. Augustine at Windesheim, not far from Zwolle, the parent-monastery of the Windesheim congregation, which soon greatly increased, and which was intended, as a monastic foundation of their own, to give the Brothers of the Common Life a firmer hold and protection in public opinion. The two branches of Groot's foundation long remained in cordial although free alliance. Florentius, without any official relation to the monasteries, was nevertheless recognised as their

head and adviser till his death in 1400. Priors of the monastery of Windesheim subsequently occupied a similar position in relation to the Brother and Sisterhouses proper. Into these latter, for which the house of Florentius at Deventer remained the original type, Florentius poured his spirit, the spirit of humility towards God, of obedience, of gentle, sympathetic, brotherly love, and a high degree of consecration promoted by spiritual exercises. At first, at all events, clerics under the presidency of some consecrated priests appear as the core of the brotherhoods. But they also admitted laymen, and the presiding priests prepared those persons who were found suitable for entrance into the canonical clergy of the Windesheim Congregation, while to those who were not found suitable the seats of their community remained as opportunities for a pious life. The chief occupation of the clerics was afforded by the copying of books, by which the community obtained great merit; but the laymen who were admitted were occupied in manual labour, gardening and agriculture. For purposes of edification, so-called *collations* (*Toespraak*) were held, partly for the populace who were admitted on Sundays and feast days, partly for the brethren at the daily common midday and evening meals. In accordance with the practical religious spirit of the community, these collations were to avoid all artistic preaching, and promote edification in a humble, simple fashion. In this way and by hearing confession, and by works of mercy, as well as by the support of poor scholars and the pursuit of practical mysticism, they became the beneficent centre of a piety which had a reviving effect on religion. They spread quickly, especially in the Netherlands, but also in Northern Germany; the Sisterhouses, however, fell away considerably in number and importance. According to the two main aspects of their conception of religion, they designated themselves *fratres bonæ voluntatis*, *i.e.* of a good will, to serve God in consecration, and *fratres devoti*, *i.e.* the devoted to God, whose mystical contemplation was to rest entirely on the sanctification of the inner life. Otherwise they are designated *collationarii* after their collations, and **Hieronymians** or **Gregorians** after their patron saints. Among the great number of men influential in these communities, GERARD ZERBOLD of Zütphen was distinguished, the right hand of Florentius, a man also of thorough theological training; further the man of practical discipline in the government of the Sisterhouses, JOHANN BRINCKERINCK, finally, the representatives of the mystical tendency which had descended in the community from Ruysbroek, HENDRIK MANDE, GERLACH PIETERS (called the second Thomas), and above all the world-famous THOMAS

A KEMPIS, a canon of the monastery on the Agnetenberg near Zwolle.

THOMAS HAMERKEN, a native of Kempen (Diocese of Cologne), born in 1380, attended the school at Deventer, was admitted by Florentius into the Brotherhood, and afterwards joined the canons on the Agnetenberg, the second foundation of Florentius, along with Windesheim, under Prior John, his brother. Here he passed a long life (†1471) in ascetic contemplation, assiduously writing books and composing ascetic treatises, a child of peace, of the love of God and the discipline of the inner life. The mysticism of the **Four Books de imitatione Christi** which bear his name is wholly rooted in the traditional ecclesiastical views, but, dismissing all the prying curiosity of the speculative understanding, it applies itself solely to the cultivation and discipline of the inner life. As the finest flower of mediæval practical mysticism the books by no means transcend the narrow limits and the onesidedness of the ascetic ideal, but within these limits they afford a positively classical expression of that love of God, which forsakes the world, *i.e.* itself, and surrenders all for all, *viz.* God, the highest good and the eternal love. The love of Christ finds its highest duty in following Him, the imitation of His life, and the highest satisfaction in serene calm.

The famous book, which, next to the Bible, has been the oftenest printed, does not itself name its author, and is often, even to this day, denied to Thomas. As early as the fifteenth century some MSS. mention the famous Chancellor JOHN GERSON as the author, a theory which, although impossible both on external and internal grounds, has to this day found defenders in France (*Vid.* O. DACHE, *Clé de l'imitation de J. Chr.*; *Gerson et ses adversaires*, Paris 1875). In the seventeenth century the Benedictines maintained the claims of an alleged Benedictine Abbot of the thirteenth century, GERSEN of Vercelli; in the eighteenth century the controversy was revived, and in spite of the refutation of Eusebius AMORT it has been revived in our own time by the champion GREGORY out of local patriotism, and by CELESTIN WOLFGRUBER (*Giovanni Gerson*, Augsburg 1880), out of zeal for his Order. But the monuments which have already been erected to him in Italy do not transform the figure of fancy into one of history. The book certainly belongs to the circle of the Brothers of the Common Life and probably to the beginning of the third decade of the fifteenth century, and Thomas is not only one of the oldest copiers of the book, but probably also the author of the four independent tractates grouped together in the book; at the same time unsolved doubts on the subject still remain. Of the most extensive literature *vid.* specially J. MALON, *Recherche historique et critique sur le véritable auteur, etc.*, Tournay 1858. K. HIRSCHKE, *Prolegomena zu einer neuen Ausgabe der imitatio Christi*, 2 vols., Berlin 1873-83. A. O. SPITZEN, *Th. a K. als Schrijver der Nachfolging, etc.*, Utrecht 1880. S. KETTLEWELL, *Th. a K. and the Brothers of Common Life*, 2 vols., London 1882. E. FROMM in ZKG., 10, 54. Of the numerous editions, *vid.* that after the autograph of 1441, ed. ROSWEYDE, Antw. 1617, 1691; ed. HIRSCHKE, Berlin 1874; ed. E. STOCK (as a facsimile), with intro. by RUELENS, London 1879. For an account of its character, ULLMANN l.c., II. 104 seq.; for an account of its general place and relations in history, L. SCHULZE, RE., 15, 601.

6. Professional Theology in the age of the Schism and the Reforming Councils.

THE eminent representatives stand under the guiding influence of Occam. The assumption of a necessary discord between natural, empirically-conditioned knowledge and the supernatural knowledge (infused by grace) of the faith, is consistent with submission to the orthodoxy of the Church, but stamps the latter with the imprint of an ecclesiastical opportunism. The irremovable impressions of the fruitlessness of scholastic subtleties and the corruption of the whole ecclesiastical system afforded an impulse on the one hand to stronger accentuation of Scriptural principle, on the other hand to the fertilization of the scholastic theology by means of mystical conceptions after the manner of the Victorines and Bonaventura, and finally to decided participation in the efforts for ecclesiastical reform which came in a flood. But ecclesiastical opportunism exercises restraint on the actual development of scriptural principle, considerably weakens the bold ideas of reform of an Occam, and, amid all the limitations of the Papacy, leaves that institution itself firmly established in the feeling, that it is not to be shaken by extreme theories, and that every step against the Pope would at the same time be a step towards dependence on a self-seeking state-church system.

PIERRE D'Ailly (ab Alliaco, probably after his birthplace, the town of Ailly in the north-west of France), professor in the University of Paris from 1389, father confessor of the young King Charles and Chancellor of the University, in 1395 Bishop of Puyx en Velay, in 1397 of Cambrai, and in 1411 Cardinal, died as Cardinal Legate in Germany in 1425. He took a most powerful share in the reforming efforts of the University and the French Court during the Schism and the Councils at Pisa and Kostnitz. His first appearance shows his ideal but unfinished views regarding the organism of the Church founded on Christ and his word. The primacy of Peter, for him, does not indicate any pre-eminence of Peter above the other apostles in the *potestas ordinis*, but only (according to John xx.) a pre-eminence in the *potestas regiminis*. Infallibility belongs only to the universal, but not to a partial, church, whether clerical or national, and the power of the Church is purely spiritual, not dominion, but service. But in practice these ideas are twisted about and traversed by considerations which draw him as little to unqualified opposition as to unqualified papalism. Against Occam he strictly adheres to the secular dominion of the popes, basing on the Donation of Constantine and the development of the Church hitherto. The idea that the universal Church could certainly exist even without the head of the Roman Church remains a hastily-sketched and unfruitful conception, and the sharp criticism of ecclesiastical corruption (vid. his *Invectiva Ezechielis contra pseudo-prophetas* and the *Epistola diaboli Leviathan* in TSCHACKERT, Appendix, p. 12) does not attack its deeper roots. In the conflict of the University of Paris with the Dominican J. Mouston, Ailly made himself the Knight of the doctrine of the *immaculata conceptio*, and succeeded in

getting Clement VII. to reject the propositions of the Dominican and the University of Paris to exclude recalcitrants from their degrees. It was not till 1403 that the reconciliation of the University with the Dominicans took place. The friend of reform next contributed essentially to retaining the French Church on the side of Benedict XIII., and when France in 1408 nevertheless dissociated itself from him, the University caused Ailly to be arrested as his adherent; the King, however, protected him. His after life is closely involved in that of the reforming Councils. *Vid.* the list of his very numerous theological, ecclesiastico-political, and philosophical writings in TSCHACKERT, *P. v. A.* 1877, 349-964. *Questiones super sententias Lombardi*, Argent. 1490, Venet. 1500. *Tractatus et sermones*, Argent. 1490 and frequently. A number of tractates in Gerson's works and elsewhere, those relating to the Council of Kostnitz in Herm. v. d. Hardt, among them those erroneously ascribed to the Canonist Franciscus Zabarella, *vid.* ZKG., I. 3. Valuable anecdota in Tschackert.

JEAN CHARLIER GERSON, Ailly's successor as professor and chancellor of the University, lived in Bavaria after the Council of Kostnitz, refused a call to Vienna, and did not return to France till after the assassination of his opponent, the powerful Duke of Burgundy; he died at Lyons in 1429.

Although a Nominalist, Gerson sought after a certain compromise with Realism, combated the sophistry of the schools by a return to Scripture and the Fathers of the Church (*De reformatione ecclesiæ 2 epistolæ*), and supplemented it by his practical, essentially psychological mysticism (*Considerationes de mystica theologia* and numerous tractates), which keeps at a distance from speculative conceptions, and even takes offence at Ruysbroek (*epist. ad Bartholomæum Carthus.*), and the treatise against Johann von Schönhofer). In preaching, too, he seeks to return to the practically fruitful and edifying, without however being able to set himself free from the play of allegory and casuistry. In his old age the celebrated theologian still catechised little children (*De parvulis ad Christum trahendis*), and in the cause of edification availed himself of the vernacular, but forbade the laity to read the Bible. By his attack upon the sophistical defence of the murder of tyrants he attracted the hatred of the Duke of Burgundy. Under the Schism it appeared to him better to resist both popes than to allow oneself to be constrained by anathemas (*De modo habendi se tempore schismatis*). At Kostnitz he defended the right of the Council to depose the Pope (*De auferibilitate papæ*), and regarded the former as the proper holder of the *potestas* of the universal Church, though at the same time he maintained the necessity of the Papacy. His free-thinking in ecclesiastical politics was, however, compatible with his orthodox zeal in the affair of Hus. *Works* by ELLIS DU PIN, Antw. 1706. A good monograph by SCHWAB, Würzburg, 1858.

NICHOLAS of Clemanges, a pupil of Ailly and Gerson, distinguished also by his classical culture, was the draftsman of most of the written documents addressed by the University to the King and Pope during the exertions for Reform. Pope Benedict XIII., who found pleasure in his good Latinity, made him his secretary. On the occurrence of the breach between the French Church and Benedict he was threatened with prosecution for high treason and with imprisonment, being accused (erroneously) with the preparation of the Bull of excommunication against the King. He withdrew into the privacy of monastic life, out of which he did not again emerge before his death, which took place in 1440. His conceptions of reform, essentially on the same basis as the above-mentioned, let us see that persistence in the ideal, purely religious idea of the Church as a community of believers, does not afford a bridge to the ecclesias-

tical political execution of the conceptions of reform. *Disputatio de concilio generali; de studio theologico* (in D'ACHERY, *Spicil.* I., and edited thereafter by SCHÖPF, Dresd. 1857, in his *Aurora* II.) and other reforming and edificatory works. His authorship of the treatise *De ruina ecclesiæ (de corruptu ecclesiæ statu)* is denied by A. MÜNTZ (*N. d. Clem., sa vie et ses écrits*, Strass. and Par. 1846), but incorrectly, *vid.* G. SCHUBERT, *Ist N. v. Clem. Verfasser*, etc., Grossenhain 1882. Opp. W. Joh. LYDIUS, 1613, 2 vols.

HENRY OF LANGENSTEIN (Henricus de Hassia) championed the ideas of ecclesiastical reform in Paris, and in the *Consilium pacis de unione ac reformatione ecclesiæ in concilio generali quærendo* (in H. v. d. Hardt, II.), written as early as 1381, threw glaring light on the corruption of the Church, and defended the right of the Church to put away a noxious pope, as well as the independence of a general council of the summons of a pope. The many-sided scholar also combated the astrological superstitions of the age and the doctrine of the immaculate conception, in both cases as Ailly's opponent. He was called to Vienna in 1390 and died in 1397. *Vid.* O. HARTWIG, *Leben und Schriften H.'s v. L.* 2 *Untersuchungen*, Marburg 1858.

THEODORIC (DIETRICH) of Niem (p. 479), the author of the above-mentioned writings, played an important part in the negotiations on reform by his treatises *De modis uniendo et reformandi ecclesiam in concilio universali; De difficultate reformationis; De necessitate reformationis in capite et membris*, *vid.* M. LENZ, 3 *Tract. D.'s v. N.*, Marbg. 1876. He distinguishes the *una sancta ecclesia*, whose head is Christ, and in which the believer is saved, even if there were no pope, and to which infallibility belongs, from the *ecclesia apostolica particularis et privata*, the Catholic Church, held together by the hierarchy, the head of which is the Pope, who certainly may be Christ's representative, if things go rightly. This Church is only an instrument for the power of the keys which belongs to the universal Church. The Pope, as fallible and sinful, is subject to the correction of the universal Church, of which the general council is representative.

MATTHIAS of Cracau worked in Prague, Paris, and Heidelberg, and died Bishop of Worms soon after the Council of Pisa. In his treatise, *De squaloribus Romanæ curiæ* (in WALCH, *Mon. medi ævi*, II. 1), he strongly criticised the abuses of the papal administration of the Church and championed the principle, that the Church holds its power directly from God, but the Pope, as chosen by her, is only her member, servant, and son. *Vid.* ULLMANN, *Ref. v. d. Ref.*, I. 279 sqq. Hübler, *die Constanzer Reform.*, Leipzig 1867, p. 364 sqq.

7. John Hus.

Sources: Hist. et monum. Joh. Hus atque Hieronymi Prag., 2 vols., Norimb. 1715; C. HÖFLER, *vid.* p. 479; PALACKY, *Documenta mag. J. H. vitam, etc., illustrantia*, Prag. 1869.—*Literature:* The works of PALACKY, FRIND, KRUMMEL (p. 479), and CZERWENKA, *Gesch. d. ec. K. in Böhmen*, Bielefeld 1869; LECHLER, *J. W.*, II.; J. LOSERTH, *Hus u. Wiclif*, Prag. 1884; *id.* in *Mitth. d. V. f. G. d. Deutschen in Böhmen*, 24 Jg. 1886, 381; LECHLER, *J. H.*, Halle 1890.

The penetrative effects of the ideas and writings of Wiclif reached Bohemia, which was in many respects prepared for reforming movements (p. 497). From the time of the marriage of Anna of Luxemburg, the daughter of Charles IV., with Richard II. of England (1382), active intercourse began between Prague and Oxford.

Students brought Wiclif's writings back to Bohemia. These gave the decisive development to the reforming disposition of John Hus.

JOHN HUS, born about 1369, at Husinecz, in southern Bohemia (hence also called John of Husinecz), as professor of philosophy from the year 1398, held his first scholastic lectures on the basis of Wiclif's philosophical writings.¹ In the next succeeding years the University was also excited by Wiclif's ideas on theology and ecclesiastical politics, and resolved in 1403 that certain propositions of Wiclif were not to be propounded or defended; in 1408, however, this was interpreted by a larger assembly as only meaning that these propositions were not to be propounded in a heretical and offensive sense. In this matter Hus's teacher, STANISLAUS of Znaim, took the side of Wiclif much more decidedly than did the quieter Hus. The latter worked at first as preacher in the chapel founded by Kreuz, a merchant, in 1391, and endowed with a living, in 1392, by Johann von Mühlheim, with the purpose of providing for preaching in Czechish. Here Hus's temperate and instructive sermons were less effective on account of their eloquence than by the impression made by his modest and austere personality, full of meekness and condescension. Along with his teacher Stanislaus, Hus was nominated synodal preacher by SBYNKO, his Archbishop. The Archbishop also included him in the commission which discovered the fraud of the alleged miracles of the bloody host at Wilsnack (*vid. infra*), for which reason he Archbishop in 1405 prohibited pilgrimages thither, and ordered the parish priests to preach against them. At that time Hus composed the somewhat scholastic treatise *De omni sanguine Christi glorificato*.

Hus's keen sermons against the clergy,² and probably also the wish not to allow Prague to gain the reputation of Wiclifite heresy, induced Sbynko, in 1408, to remove Hus from his office as synodal preacher. Besides, at that time Sbynko still adhered to Gregory XII., while Hus and the Bohemian nation in the University had followed the example of France in declaring for neutrality in the schism. This neutrality was also meant to be promoted by the alteration in the statutes of the University according to the mandate of King Wenzel, of the 14th January, 1409, which assigned a preponderance of votes to the Bohemian nation, giving it three votes and the others only one.³

The emigration of thousands occasioned the foundation of the

¹ LECHLER, *J.H.*, p. 29, after Dudik.

² Examples in KRUMMEL, *Appendix*, 561 sqq.

³ PALACKY, *Docum.*, 347.

University of Leipsic, and the now prevailing preponderance of the specifically Czech element in Prague. At this time Hus stood at the summit of his influence; he was chosen rector by the university in October, 1409. Next, when the Archbishop had submitted to Pope Alexander V., who was chosen by the Council of Pisa, on the ground of a Papal Bull (10th March, 1410), he caused Wiclif's heretical writings to be delivered up to himself, and in accordance with the judgment of a provincial synod, they were burned, and, with a view to shaking Hus's position, he forbade preaching in other than the regular parish churches. Hus appealed to the Pope who was to be better informed, the University entered a protest on his behalf, but Sbynko proclaimed excommunication against Hus and all who adhered to his appeal. Violent disturbances ensued in Prague; the king refused the Archbishop the application of the stoppage of salary against the excommunicated, and took steps to bring about a reconciliation with the Pope. But Cardinal Colonna, who was commissioned by the Pope to investigate the matter, decided for the archbishop on the 24th August, 1410, and the cardinals who were sent to Bohemia, in consequence of Wenzel's counter representations, confirmed Colonna's sentence, and themselves proclaimed the ban against Hus on the 15th March, 1411. The king laid the Archbishop's revenues under arrest, and compelled him to enter into negotiations for a settlement, which however he finally avoided by flight to Hungary, where he shortly died. The legates who brought to Prague the pallium for his successor, Albik, hitherto body physician to the king, brought also into Bohemia the offensive **Crusading Bull** of John XXIII., against LADISLAUS, of Naples, against which Hus and his adherent, the knight JEROME, held a disputation in the university (7th June, 1412), which gave expression to their indignation at the abuse of spiritual weapons for earthly purposes. Hus preached publicly against the trade in sin and the blasphemous assumption of the Pope, and the Pope's bull was publicly insulted in Prague. Three young persons, who had reviled the indulgence as mere lying and fraud, were beheaded, but were revered as saints by the people, and solemnly buried by Hus. Some of his closest friends, STANISLAUS of Znaim and PALEC, now timidly withdrew and passed over to his opponents, and the parochial clergy complained to the Pope. Cardinal PETRUS DE S. ANGELO now proclaimed the ban against Hus, and the interdict against his place of residence. Hus appealed to Christ, the one incorruptible judge, left Prague by the king's desire, found welcome in the castles of his friends, and composed the treatise *De ecclesia*, which is entirely

founded on Wiclif. But he soon preached also in various places (including Husinecz) to great crowds in the open air.

The Emperor Sigismund, the brother and prospective successor of Wenzel in Bohemia, now invited Hus, under assurance of imperial escort, to present himself before the Council of Kostnitz, which was just gathering, for the purpose of saving the ecclesiastical honour of Bohemia by his vindication of himself. Hus consented, after he had in vain attempted in Prague to procure a trial before a provincial synod. Under the protecting escort of three Bohemian noblemen, commissioned by Sigismund, he departed on the 11th October, 1414, for Kostnitz, where he received the imperial letter of safe conduct. On his journey he had received surprisingly favourable impressions of the disposition of the Germans. In Kostnitz he found a friendly welcome from Pope John, whose own position was already uncertain. But his opponents cunningly brought about his imprisonment in an unhealthy dungeon of the Dominican monastery, against which his escort, the Herr von Chlum, protested as a violation of the honour of the Emperor. Sigismund himself, on his arrival, fell into a violent rage on the subject, but nevertheless, without cancelling the procedure, on the 1st January, 1415, he gave free course to the process against Hus, and indeed, after John's departure, handed over Hus to the custody of the Bishop of Kostnitz, who kept him chained in his castle of Gottlieben, and strictly separated from his friends. Hus defended himself before the first committee appointed to investigate his cause as early as December, 1414, partly setting right the points of accusation extracted from his writings, partly justifying them by Scripture and sayings of the Fathers. A new point was added when his adherent, JACOB of Mies (Jacobellus), demanded in Prague the administration of the Lord's Supper in both forms. Hus declared participation in the cup to be only allowed and salutary, and advised his friends to exert themselves to get the Council to permit it. But when the Council (14th June, 1415), declared the giving of the cup to the laity to be prohibited, Hus encouraged his friends in Prague no longer to raise objection to the demand of Jacob of Mies. During his imprisonment in the castle of Gottlieben secret negotiations were conducted with him, especially through AILLY. Barons of the Margravate of Moravia pressed (8th May, 1415) upon Sigismund that the trial should be in public, and a memorial (12th May), by 250 nobles of Bohemia and Moravia, demanded that Hus should be set free. When Hus was brought to Kostnitz for public trial on the 5th of June, the Council had just passed sentence against WICLIF, whose forty-five propo-

sitions were declared heretical, himself a heretic who had died in his false doctrines, and whose body ought to be exhumed from consecrated ground. In the first two sittings (5th and 7th June) the real measure of Hus's dependence on Wiclif did not greatly appear. He did not deny his esteem for Wiclif's person, but declared his refusal to condemn Wiclif's forty-five propositions, but with the qualification that he could not hold them *all* to be heretical, and pointed out that in his writings he had not denied the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation as Wiclif had done. During the third and decisive sitting (8th June) thirty-nine articles out of his treatise *De ecclesia* and his polemical tractates were recited, in which the idea of the Church, borrowed from Wiclif, comes out in its entire precision and religious idealism, but also in its incompatibility with the dogmatic of the Roman ecclesiastical system. Loserth has recently proved to conviction in how high a degree Hus's treatise *De ecclesia* is dependent on Wiclif's work of the same name and his treatise *De potestate papæ*. In the negotiations with Ailly, Hus declared himself ready, if at a new trial for which he begged, his reasons should not be found satisfactory according to reason and Scripture, to submit himself to the instruction and even the correction and judgment of the Council, but rejected the suggestion that he should abjure his false doctrines forthwith; and all further exertions were wrecked on the fidelity of his conscience. Accordingly on the 6th July, 1415, after a detailed statement of the reasons, during which Hus twice raised his voice in contradiction, Hus was deposed as an obstinate heretic, his expulsion from the priesthood was carried out in the form of divesting him of all priestly insignia, and his soul given over to the devil; but he commended it to the gracious Lord Christ. He was then delivered over to the secular power, with the traditional hypocritical prayer to spare his life, and immediately led to the place of execution and committed to the flames. The legend of the old grandam, or poor little peasant, who zealously dragged wood to the pile, and caused him to exclaim, "*O sancta simplicitas*," would agree with his pious disposition. Hus's "prophecy" of the goose and the swan has its historical kernel in his frequent expression in letters that instead of the goose (=hus) who was caught in the noose, other birds of higher flight would come and bring the snares to nought.

JEROME of Prague, the passionate teacher of Wiclifite doctrines, which he had imbibed in Oxford, and had spread in Bohemia and elsewhere (Poland, Croatia, etc.), had come unsummoned to Kostnitz (April, 1415), and had requested and obtained from the Council a letter of safe-conduct for the purpose of his defence, which however was only meant to protect him against illegal violence.

not against judicial procedure. Within fifteen days he was to appear before the Council, but escaped by flight. On the way to Bohemia he was arrested in the Upper Palatinate by Duke John of Bavaria and brought to Kostnitz in chains. Here he agreed to recant in the autumn at the nineteenth session on the 23rd September. When, however, he was still detained and accusations were raised against him, he found the courage of his convictions once more, repented his recantation as the greatest sin of his life, and (30th May, 1416) was led as a relapsed heretic to death by fire which had prepared a slow and painful end for the strong man. Poggio, the Papal Secretary, a humanist without any real interest in the controversy as to the faith, nevertheless extolled with admiration Jerome's eloquence, readiness, and steadfastness worthy of a Stoic.

8. The Hussites.

Sources: *Monum. concil. gener. sæc. XV.*, I, Vindob. 1857, contains the writings of Joh. de Ragusio (ed. PALACKY), of Aegidius Carlerius, of Ebendorf and of Joh. de Turonis (ed. BIRK) on the negotiations of the Council of Bale with the Bohemians. In addition *vid.* the sources and literature under § 7.

The fate of Hus called forth profound agitation, at once religious and national, in Bohemia. The Bohemian Diet addressed (1st September, 1415) a vigorous declaration to the Council, and Bohemian and Moravian magnates formed a league for the protection of free preaching on their properties, and would only acknowledge the ecclesiastical ordinances of the Bishop and the Pope so far as they were according to Scripture. The much less numerous Roman counter league, with King Wenzel and the Archbishop of Prague at its head, afforded little resistance. The Council issued a summons to combat with the Bohemian heresy, the leaders of which were to answer for it before the Council, and commanded the leagues formed in favour of the false doctrines to be dissolved. About the same time MARTIN V. issued a general summons to the hierarchy of all countries to suppress the heresy, with a long list of inquisitorial questions to be applied. After the death of Wenzel (1419), Bohemia, under the dominion of the Hussites, refused the crown of Bohemia to his brother Sigismund, who had broken his word to Hus.¹ The

¹ At the Diet of Worms Charles V. repudiated the imputation that he would not observe Luther's safe-conduct with the expression that he did not desire to have to blush as Sigismund had had. Hus's letter of safe-conduct, according to recent evidence, had certainly not the force of a judicial safe-conduct, but only that of a passport, only intended to protect him against violence and not against legal judicial procedure, in which case the promise of safe-conduct for the return journey could only have come into application in case of his acquittal. But even thus the king's honour is not really saved, as is best shown by the King's own anger at Hus's arrest. Hus had not come in consequence of a judicial citation, but voluntarily, at Sigismund's desire. His arrest did not take place in legal form, but was brought about by artful devices, against which the Emperor's safe-conduct ought to have protected him, if the former's honour was to remain unstained. *Vid.* W. BERGER, *J. H. u. König Sigismund*, Augsb. 1871, p. 104 sqq. and 177 sqq.

leader of the Hussites, the one-eyed Ziska of Trocznow, who had his base of operations in the fortified mount **Tabor**, made himself master of Prague, and the frightful Hussite wars began their devastating course. Sigismund summoned the power of the German Empire against the Hussites, but, in spite of a Papal Bull of Crusade and Indulgence, found the empire little inclined to sacrifice itself for the sake of the interests of his domestic power. Till 1427 the Hussites victoriously repelled all attacks, then under the elder PROCOPIUS they fell upon Germany as a frightful scourge of the empire. The Hussites had found in the demand for the **cup** the watchword and rallying symbol for the conflict for religious freedom, but the demand for the reformation of Holy Mother Church according to the **law of Christ** exhibited many divergent tendencies. The moderate party confined themselves to the demands formulated in the four **Articles of Prague** of 1420: 1. Free preaching of the Word of God in Bohemia; 2. the granting of the cup to all pious Christians; 3. the reduction of the clergy to apostolic poverty and piety of life by depriving them of secular dominion and earthly goods; 4. the establishment of Christian discipline by the authorities of every rank. The University and Old Town of Prague belonged to this party of PRAGITES (afterwards called CALIXTINES) represented by Czenko of Wartenberg, Jacob of Miesa and others. On the other hand the radical and violently progressive party rejected the doctrines of purgatory, the worship of saints, images, and relics, abolished ecclesiastical feasts, desired preaching in the vernacular exclusively and denied priests in a state of mortal sin the capacity of administering the sacraments. The place of the church begins to be taken by the idea of a democratically conceived **Christian community**, which, founded on Scripture, begins also to adopt an attitude of reserve towards ecclesiastical science, opposes a rigorous morality to secularism, protests in God's name against all the compulsory resources of the secular power, but does not recoil with horror from the application of force of arms in matters concerning the kingdom of God itself. Their chiefs were Nicholas of Pistna, John of Ziska, and others, their centre the small town of Austi, with the hill of Tabor fortified by Ziska.¹

From these "**Taborites**," after Ziska's death, his most zealous adherents, who would not acknowledge the aged Procopius as chief, branched off under the name of the "**Orphans**" (Orphanites).

¹ The initial place of assembly with this name lay in the district of Bechin; but the name was afterwards transferred to the hill near Austi; *vid.* PALACKY, III. 1, 394 sq.

In the Hussite Wars for the law of God and the religious freedom of the nations the Taborites and Orphanites stood at the head of the collective Hussite party. But when the last crusade against the Bohemians, which was led by Cardinal Julius Cæsarini, came to wreck by the defeat near Thauss (1432), and the Council at Bâle now proffered negotiations for a settlement, its invitation met with response among the Pragites and their most eminent theologian ROKYZANA, who had already found the preponderance of the fanatical Taborites oppressive. While the Taborites issued a fulminating proclamation full of embitterment against the Church and monasteries, full of hatred to the Pope and mistrust of the Council, the National Diet of the 10th February, 1432, resolved to send deputies to Bâle, and conditions for the negotiations were settled between the deputies of the Council and those of the Bohemians at the assembly at Eger with the participation of the Margrave of Brandenburg and Duke John of Bavaria. The Bohemians were to receive a safe-conduct, and out of regard to them steps were to be taken in Bâle, to the utmost extent possible, against the vices which were openly in vogue and against frivolity of life. It was a remarkable moment when a General Council, on the point of falling out with the Pope himself, set about negotiations with a nation which came forward in favour of ecclesiastical reform, as with a power of equal rank. The Council accepted the conditions agreed on at Eger, as likewise did the Bohemian nation at the National Diet at Kuttenberg (August, 1432), even Procopius being won in favour of them. The German lords and cities granted the Bohemian deputies safe-conduct for their journey through Germany, and they, three hundred in number, were honourably received in Bâle, and on the Feast of the Three Kings in 1433 were able to hold divine worship in their own manner in their lodgings. Rokyzana at the head of the Pragites held mass, which only differed from the usual by the administration of the cup to the laity. Among the Taborites, on the other hand, there was seen a plain, unadorned service, without sacred robes and ceremonial display, with only prayer, preaching and communion. The long-winded speeches and negotiations, which were not strictly confined to the discussion of the four Articles, continually revealed unbridgeable oppositions, when, alongside of Rokyzana, whose own attitude showed some keenness, PETER PAYNE, a Wiclifite who had been received by the Bohemians, and the Taborites and Orphans joined in the debate. The interrogatory articles propounded by Cæsarini, to which the Bohemians were to reply with yes or no, necessarily excluded all possibility of a real union and at the same time revealed the deep schism among the

Bohemians themselves, by means of which it was probably calculated to gain the moderate party and separate them from the determined. The Council now demanded that the Hussites, after the concession of the cup, should themselves enter the Synod and leave it to adjust the remaining points, *i.e.* that they should submit to the preponderance of the majority. An agreement was not to be gained on this basis. After long negotiations and several deputations from either side, an agreement was finally attained at the Bohemian National Diet in the so-called **Compacts of Prague** (30th November, 1433) by means of an extraordinary weakening of the Four Articles of Prague. The cup was only conceded on the condition that in all other matters the Bohemians should conform to the belief and ritual of the Church; the desired measures of discipline were relegated to the appropriate courts and thus from the very outset made ineffective; the desired free preaching of the gospel was only permitted to preachers ordained and provided with the *missio canonica*; finally the important principle: *non licet clero bonis temporalibus sæculariter dominari* was allowed to drop entirely. In this way Wiclif's spirit was entirely set aside. The Calixtines alone allowed themselves to be gained in favour of this agreement, the Taborites and Orphans protested and continued the conflict.

The parties now consolidated themselves and came into sharp opposition to each other. The moderate or noble party now included nearly all the nobles, including those of imperial and Catholic views and in addition the University and Old-Town of Prague, while the Taborite and democratic party, under the leadership of Procopius, included the most of the cities as well as the New-Town of Prague. The storming of the latter, the raising of the siege of Pilsen, and the defeat of the Taborites, and the death of the two Procopii in the battle of Lipan (Böhmischbrod, 30th May, 1434), marks the victory of the **Calixtines** or **Utraquists**, who maintained the upper hand over the Taborites and also over the imperial and Catholic party. The former lost their political importance and only succeeded in vindicating their Wiclifite principles on individual points. At the Diet of St. Matthias (Autumn, 1435) Rokyzana was elected Archbishop of Prague, at first only in secret. The Compacts, after continued negotiations, were confirmed at **Iglau** (1436) and accepted by Sigismund, who was now acknowledged as King of Bohemia. But the more determined Utraquists sought to give the meagre concessions a wider interpretation; Sigismund's ambiguous behaviour strengthened the opposing effort of the Council of Bâle. In common with the Legate Philibert

he worked against the acknowledgment of Rokyzana, who was accused of preaching seditious sermons and had finally to flee and leave the administration of his archbishopric to his opponents. After Sigismund's death (9th December, 1437) his son-in-law, Duke Albert of Austria, was chosen king by the Catholics and moderate Calixtines, while the more determined adherents of Rokyzana and the Taborite elements raised the young Polish Prince Casimir to the throne. The conflict of parties, which immediately began anew, was interrupted by Albert's death in 1439, and it was agreed that, until his son Ladislaus (Posthumus) came of age, two governors of the kingdom should be appointed, one Catholic and one Calixtine, GEORGE PODIEBRAD. A disputation on the religious differences between Utraquists and Taborites was arranged in July, 1443, at Kuttenberg, in which the Taborites defended Wiclif's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which the Utraquists declared to be Picard heresy.¹ The National Diet in Prague in 1444 recognised the doctrine of the Utraquists, championed by Rokyzana, and from that time many Taborites gradually attached themselves to the Utraquists without being forcibly compelled. But the Bohemian Brethren now represented the true spiritual heritage of Wiclif in an entirely new form (*vid. infra*).

9. Eugenius IV. and the Council of Bâle.

Sources: Acts of the Council of Bâle, MANSI xxix.-xxxi., 290; JOHN OF SEGOVIA, *Hist. gest. gener. synodi Basil. libri* 19, ed. BIRK in Monumenta Concil. general. saec. XV. tom. II. et III. a., Vindob. 1873 and 1876; AUGUSTINI PATRICII *summa concil. Basil. Florent., etc.*; in HARTZHEIM, *Conc. Germ.* V., 777-871 (ostensibly an abstract from J. of SEGOVIA, which is only correct from chap. 65 onwards, the beginning is based on the *collectanea* of Cardinal Capranika, *vid. A. ZIMMERMANN*, l.c. 110); AEN. SILVIUS, *comment. de gest. Bas. conc.*, Col. 1535 and in C. FEA, *Pius II. papa Rom. a calumniis vindicatus*, Rom. 1853; some points in DÖLLINGER, *Materialien z. Gesch. d. 15 u. 16. Jh.* II., Rgsb. 1863.—*Literature:* WESSENBERG, RAUMER, HEFELE (p. 479), CECCONI, *studi storici sul conc. di Firenze* 1869; F. P. ABERT, *P. Eugenius IV.*, Mainz 1884.

After Martin's death the cardinals, whom he had allowed very little power, drew up a capitulation of election with a view to securing their rights and claims, which Eugenius IV. (1431-47) accepted.² The Council, which met at Bâle on the 23rd July, 1431, but which was at first but thinly attended, as the sovereign body

¹ Picard as a name for heretics is derived from Beghards; cf. H. HAUPT, *Waldenserthum u. Inquisition*, p. 38, note 3.

² The Cardinals had already made a similar attempt in 1352, which, however, Innocent VI. annulled.

of representatives of the Church, immediately entered into negotiations with the Hussites. Against the command of Eugenius to break up the assembly on that account, Cardinal Cæsarini made serious representations referring to the threatening dangers, and also the wide-spread dissatisfaction in Germany. Those present at Bâle declared (21st January, 1432) their intention to persist without regard to the dissolution of the Council by the Pope, denied the Pope the right of dissolving the Council without its own consent, confirmed the resolutions of Kostnitz as to the independence and supreme authority of General Councils, and in several cases as a supreme ecclesiastical authority interfered with the papal administration of the Church. NICHOLAS CUSANUS (Krypffs [Krebs] a native of Cues on the Moselle), the Dean of Coblenz, in his treatise *De catholica concordantia*, gave very strong expression to the now predominant views of the supreme authority of the representation of the Church in the Council and of the independence of secular princes of the Pope.¹

Encouraged by the University of Paris, the Council now ventured to summon the Pope to attend, and threatened to depose him. He, pressed to extremity in Italy by Matteo Visconti of Milan and by a revolt in Rome, and partly deserted by the Cardinals, agreed to acknowledge the Council of Bâle,² which now admitted his legates and entrusted them with the presidency. Reforming resolutions of all sorts were now vigorously taken up. The Council abolished most of the papal reservations, the annates, fees for pallia, taxes, etc., and thus threatened to cut off all financial resources from the Pope, who was helpless in his own country. Eugenius desired only to attach his consent to the condition of his being previously secured by providing for the Curia in other ways, the Council on the other hand would only guarantee the fulfilment of its promises after confirmation by the Pope. In regard to other demands for reform also, the Council practically adopted a tendency which was meant to degrade the Pope to the position of an executive official of the Council. The gravest reproaches arose between Eugenius and the Council. Matters came the length of a complete state of war, in which personal and local interests strongly co-operated alongside of the imperative necessities of ecclesiastical reform. A French bishop declared: "Either we must snatch the Apostolic Chair out

¹ Cf. also the tractate *De auctoritate præsidendi in concilio generali* in DÛx, *der Deutsche Cardinal Nic. v. Cusa*, Rgsb. 1874, Appendix.

² Bull: *Dudum* of the 15th December, 1433, altered in accordance with the request of the Council itself.

of the hands of the Italians, or so strip it, that it does not matter where it remains."

The negotiations entered into with the Greeks were now utilized by Eugenius with a view to bring about the transference of the Council to Italy. The Greek ambassadors would not enter into negotiations in Bâle itself, but requested a place in Italy agreeable to the Pope. In the very stormy twenty-fifth session (March, 1437) Cardinal d'Allemand carried the resolution of the majority that negotiations with the Greeks should be carried on at Bâle or contingently in Avignon or Savoy. The minority with the cardinals declared for Florence or Utine. Eugenius, who had already been arraigned by the Council, took advantage of this to transfer the Council (1437) to Ferrara, where it was actually opened in January, 1438. Those who persisted in remaining in Bâle declared suspension against Eugenius on the 24th January, 1438. The papal assembly was soon transferred from Ferrara to Florence, ostensibly on account of a sickness, probably in truth for the sake of the financial resources of the latter city. Here, in 1439, Eugenius was actually successful in bringing about a union with the Greeks (*vid. infra*), certainly a mere momentary success, which however helped his position, while the Council of Bâle visibly declined in authority.

The national churches, especially of France and Germany, now sought to secure the reforming ordinances of the Council for themselves, without on that account breaking with Pope Eugenius. Under Charles VII. of France the assembly of spiritual and secular magnates at **Bourges**, to which deputies were sent both by Eugenius and by the Bâle party, adopted the Bâle decrees of reform hitherto issued, with some modifications (7th July, 1438), and they were then also registered by the Parliament; this is the so-called **Pragmatic Sanction** of Bourges.¹ The German electors, before the election of their new king (Albert II.), issued their declaration of neutrality and made their proposals for the settlement of the quarrel, which were also approved by France and other powers. At the great diet at Frankfort (26th March, 1439) the so-called **Charter of Acceptation** was completed, in which Germany adopted the results so far of the Council of Bâle. For the rest, neutrality did not hinder princes and prelates from procuring, either from Eugenius or the party of Bâle, favours of all sorts, partly in open contradiction of the Decrees of Bâle.

The Council of Bâle, already considerably weakened by the calling

¹ The full text in M. DE VILEVAULT, *Ordonnances des rois de France de la II^{me} race*. Paris 1782, XIII. 267.

away of the cardinals and the opening of the Council at Ferrara, and more and more deserted by prelates, now, under the leadership of the sole cardinal present, Cardinal d'Allemand, deposed Eugenius on the 25th June, 1439, as a disturber of the peace of the Church, a heretic and perjurer. Only about twenty prelates (seven bishops, no Spanish and only one Italian), on the other hand three hundred priests and doctors, took this extreme step, which immediately called forth the protest of the most prominent German princes and alienated sympathy from the Council. Thereupon it elected Duke Amadeus of Savoy as Pope FELIX V. He had previously shown much interest in the Church, and now lived, since the death of his wife, in retirement on the Lake of Geneva, surrounded by the Knightly Order of St. Maurice which he had founded. Scruples against the election of a layman, who had been married, and a secular prince, were repressed by the need of a wealthy pope, related to many princes. Felix found only small recognition in Savoy, Switzerland, and among a few German princes, bishops and cities; the majority adhered to Eugenius or held back in a neutral attitude. The last sitting was held at Bâle in the year 1443; from that time the Council only existed nominally. Nicholas Cusanus had long made his peace with Eugenius. Aeneas Silvius now also carried out this change of front. As early as 1441 the German electors negotiated with Eugenius through Gregory of Heimburg, Syndic of Nuremberg, and held out prospects of his being acknowledged in case he should decide to give express recognition to the decrees of Constance and Bâle. But Eugenius sought again to deprive the individual countries, especially Germany and France, of the fruits of the efforts for reform. Charles VII., however, who otherwise acknowledged him, adhered to the Pragmatic Sanction. Eugenius had better success in Germany, where Frederick III. rather inclined towards Eugenius, but other princes to Felix V. The Archbishop of Cologne, Jacob von Sirk, and the Bishop of Münster were deprived by Eugenius of the entire ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the lands of the Duke of Cleve, exempted the latter also from dues, and did not hesitate in the interest of the party-conflict to sacrifice weighty rights of the Church to the secular power and still further to increase that territorial ecclesiastical influence of the princes which is so strongly marked in the close of the Middle Ages. A titular bishop deputed by the Bishop of Utrecht was to perform the episcopal functions at the desire of the Duke, and invest the clergy to be nominated by the Duke.¹ Eugenius even

¹ The saying then was : *dux Cliviæ est papa in suis terris.*

dared in 1445 to depose two Electors of the Empire, the Archbishops of Cologne and Trèves. On the other hand the German electors, united under the presidency of the Elector of Mayence at Frankfort in 1446, required of Eugenius, through their ambassador, Gregory of Heimburg, unambiguous recognition of the two Councils, the summoning of a new one, chartered security of German ecclesiastical freedom, *i.e.*, the Charter of Acceptation of 1439, and withdrawal of the deposition of the two Archbishops; in case of refusal they threatened to take the side of the party of Bâle. But Aeneas Silvius, who was now in the service of Frederick III. and his Chancellor Schirk, and had arrived in Rome before the electoral ambassadors, interfered in such a manner that the German princes modified their demands and Eugenius confirmed them in four Bulls, but added a fifth with the declaration that they were in no way to prejudice the papal rights. Shortly before his death the German princes acknowledged Eugenius. NICHOLAS V. (1447-55) confirmed the Bulls of his predecessors and obtained the acknowledgment of the princes assembled at Aschaffenburg. Their attempts to settle the Church question further at the Diet at Ratisbon, were crossed by Aeneas Silvius (now already Bishop of Triest), who induced the Emperor to conclude a concordat for the German nation at Vienna in 1448, which deprived the German Church once more of nearly all the liberties it had obtained. As the **Concordat of Aschaffenburg**, it then received the force of imperial law. It is true that this was not intended to invalidate the Charter of Acceptation of Mayence of 1439, so far as its ordinances were not expressly abrogated, but the Acceptation of Mayence was soon forgotten and the Concordat of Aschaffenburg (Vienna) appeared as an independent treaty and the sole fruit of the Council of Bâle for Germany. Princes and bishops were gained in favour of it by special concessions.¹

The remnant of the Council of Bâle adjourned in 1448 to Lausanne, acknowledged Nicholas V., and dissolved in 1449. Felix V. abdicated and became Bishop of Sabina. Then, when Frederick III. received the imperial crown in 1452, he caused Aeneas Silvius, in an adulatory address to the Pope, to propose a crusade instead of the promised general council. The victory of the reaction of the old despiritualized Papacy is expressed in the words of Aeneas :

¹ The Elector of Brandenburg, *e.g.*, received the concession of himself appointing to his feudatory bishoprics of Brandenburg, Lebus and Havelberg, the spiritual electors receiving the so-called *indultum* (power of appointing to benefices) which became vacant during the papal months.

"ubi sanctitas tua, ibi concilium, ibi reges, ibi mores, ibi decreta salubrisque reformatio."

10. The Greek Church, the Florentine Union and the Fall of the Byzantine Empire.

Sources: NICEPHORUS GREGORAS, *hist. rom.* (from 1204 to 1359, rich in documents on the ecclesiastical controversies of his time), 3 vols., Bonn 1829 and 1855 (Mgr. 148); JOHANNES CANTACUZENUS, *historiarum libri IV.*, Bonn 1828-32, 3 vols., (Mgr. 153 and 154); MIKLOSICH and MÜLLER, *acta et diplomata græca mediæ ævi*, Vind. 1860, I. (Mgr. 152, 1269 and 151, 679). On the Florentine Union: Documents collected by H. JUSTINIANI in 1638 in Harduin, IX., 669; (DOROTHEUS MYTIL.) *historia concilii Florentini*, MANSI, XXXI. 997; SYLV. SGUROPULOS (more correctly SYROPULOS), *vera hist. unionis non veræ conc. flor.*, ed. G. Cryghton, Hag. Comitum 1660; CECCONI, *studi storici sul concilio di Firenze I.*, Firenze 1869; FROMMANN, *Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Florentinischen Kircheneinigung*, Halle 1872; id. in JdTh. 1877.—*Literature*: J. G. V. ENGELHARDT in ZhTh. 1838; W. GASS, *Beiträge zur Kirchl. Lit. u. DG. des griech. MA. I.* GENNADIUS U. PLETHO, Breslau 1844, II. Die Mystik des NICOLAUS CABASILAS, Greifswald 1849; F. J. STEIN, *Stud. über d. Hesychasten*, Wien 1874; BESSARION, *opp.* Mgr. 161.—On the alleged Synod of Constantinople (1450); the Acts in LEO ALLATIUS (*vid.* p. 439) *add.* III. 4; SOPH. OECONOMUS, τὰ σωζόμενα ἐκκλ. συγγρ. Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ ἐξ Οἰκονόμων I., Athen. 1862.

The union with Rome brought about by Michael Palæologus at the Council of Lyons in 1274 had speedily fallen away, the Emperor himself being overthrown in 1283. But a division of the Church, for which he was to blame, survived him for a considerable time. The Patriarch ARSENIUS of Constantinople had already, in 1262, proclaimed the ban against the restorer of the Byzantine Empire on account of his crime against the young son of Theodorus Laskaris, and after vain attempts to appease him had been exiled in 1267. But a strong ecclesiastical party adhered to him, and it was not till 1312 that the Patriarch NIPHON succeeded in abolishing the schism. The increasing internal confusion and external oppression by the Turks continually fostered anew the desire of the emperors to unite with the Latins, so as to obtain help. The Palæologue ANDRONICUS III. sent Abbot BARLAAM, who was of Calabrian descent, to Avignon to negotiate with Pope Benedict XII. But the attempt was wrecked on the papal demand of unconditional adoption of the Roman doctrines.

Having returned from his mission, Barlaam attacked the fanatical monastic party of the so-called **Hesychasts**, who had their chief centre of support among the monks in the monasteries of Mount Athos. The state of ecstasy which was here favoured was brought about physically by the enforced rest of contemplation of the clouds;

the phenomena of light thereby produced were regarded as products of the uncreated divine light, such as had surrounded Christ with light at the transfiguration. Barlaam and a certain Akindynos, who moreover were hated among the monks as friends of the Latins, mocked at the fanatical monks and accused them of Ditheism, because, in the divine light, they adored something eternal and uncreated alongside of God. As a matter of fact their mystical fanaticism, in genuine Greek fashion, was directly based upon the hypothesis of an energy (*ἐνέργεια*), distinct from the divine nature and yet itself divine, which made its appearance in the light already spoken of. Men's minds became heated, and thus vigorous party divisions arose, in which GREGORIUS PALAMAS, afterwards Archbishop of Thessalonica, specially championed the ideas of the Hesychasts, and NICEPHORUS GREGORAS combated them. At a Synod of **Constantinople** (1341) Palamas really obtained the victory, and Barlaam, by the non-success of his accusations, was obliged to go to the West, where he attached himself to the Latin Church, and died as bishop in Calabria (1348). But the curious controversy continued through several further synods with alternating results, till finally the doctrine of Palamas was again victorious (1351), inasmuch as the Emperor JOHN V., CANTACUZENUS, who came to the throne in 1341, had also been obliged to give way to the opinion of the zealous monks.

Among the representatives of the peculiar sort of mysticism which here sought expression, there was also NICHOLAS CABASILAS, the successor of Palamas in the Archiepiscopal chair of Thessalonica, who still strove with Nicephorus Gregoras over the doctrine of the Hesychasts. He is, after his kind, a very important representative of the later Greek mysticism which grew up out of the old patristic theology, and which, following the example of the Areopagite, develops in the doctrine of the sacraments the idea of the transference of supersensuous divine forces into the Church, and gave a religiously valuable presentation of this mysticism in the treatise *Περὶ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ζωῆς*.

In spite of the deep-rooted antipathies of the Greeks, the Palæologue JOHN VII., in his hard-pressed situation, made a further attempt to gain help by union with the Latins, and Eugenius IV. willingly responded to him. At the head of a great number of Greeks (700 persons) he landed at Venice in the spring of 1438, and thence passed to Ferrara, whither Eugenius had summoned the Council in opposition to the Bâle party. But few of the Greeks whom he had brought with him were inwardly cordial to the

establishment of a union. The most zealous exertions in its favour were made by BESSARION, the learned and classically cultured Archbishop of Nicæa, and along with him, by Bishop ISIDORE, of Kieff.¹ The majority were at best half-hearted in the matter, the Archbishop of Thessalonica, MARCUS EUGENIUS, even with barely concealed hostility. In the negotiations great stress was laid on petty questions of etiquette. The solemn opening of the Union Synod took place on the 6th April, 1438, the transference to Florence in February, 1439. The endless formal and material discussions on the much-contested *filioque* made no progress from this one point for a long time, and several times threatened to lead to a breach, till finally the Greeks agreed to acknowledge the equal authorization of the formula *a patre et filio* and the *a patre per filium* found in the Greek Fathers, on condition that the addition to the Creed should not be exacted from them, and on the other hand, that the maintenance of their own peculiar ceremonies should be permitted them

¹ Properly of Moscow. The residence of the Russian Grandprinces had been transferred, in 1170, from Kieff to Vladimir, and accordingly the seat of the Metropolitans also in 1299, until IVAN DANILOWITSCH transferred it along with his residence to Moscow in 1328. About 1320 Kieff, with Ukraine, had come under the dominion of the then still heathen Lithuanians under GEDIMIN. Over Kieff Gedimin appointed a relation who had received Greek baptism, while he himself showed some inclination to Roman Christianity, so that, at that time Pope John XXII. attempted to institute a Catholic bishopric in Kieff. Under Gedimin's successor, OLGERS, Roman emissaries (Dominicans) and Greek clergy opposed each other in Lithuania. Olgerd received baptism from the latter, but soon fell away again. It was JAGELLO, the husband of the Polish Hedwig, who first bought the Polish crown by baptism according to the Latin rite, and the introduction of Christianity into Lithuania. During this time a schism broke out between the Metropolitan of Kieff, who was appointed from Constantinople, and the Metropolitan of Moscow, which was abolished in 1390 by the acknowledgment of the Metropolitan of Moscow as the universal Metropolitan for the Russian Church. But under WITOLD (Alexander), the ruler appointed for Lithuania by Jagello, the entire separation of Kieff from Byzantium, and so from Moscow, was carried out. An assembly, in great part of Russian Bishops, in 1414, while adhering to the orthodox Greek faith, proclaimed ecclesiastical separation from Constantinople on account of the uncanonical procedure of the Byzantine emperors in ecclesiastical affairs. Thus, to some extent, the first step was taken in an approach to Rome. The Metropolitan, GREGORY of Kieff visited the Council of Kostnitz, where, however, he declared that he had no desire to pass over to the Church of Rome (Johann Lindenblatt's *Chronik*, ed. by VOIGT and SCHUBERT, 1820, p. 335). ISIDORE, a Greek from Thessalonica, who had already been won in Constantinople for union with Rome and had been consecrated Metropolitan of Moscow, found a friendly welcome from the Russian Grandprince, Wassitz, who did not prevent him from going to Ferrara, although he himself declared against any deviation from Greek doctrine and custom.

in the agreement. After, on this basis, the Emperor had assured himself of the promise of Latin assistance, union was also arrived at on the other questions in controversy (purgatory, sacrifice of the mass, leavened bread in the Eucharist, and the primacy of the Pope, not without great ambiguity on both sides). On the 6th July, 1439, there followed the solemn proclamation of the Decree of Union by JULIUS CÆSARINI in the Latin language, and BESSARION in the Greek. The acknowledgment of the Roman primacy, which, moreover, was most ambiguously stated, was made worthless by the express reservation of all rights of the Patriarch of Constantinople and the other eastern Patriarchs. ISIDORE issued from Ofen (1st March, 1440) a pastoral letter to all the dioceses in Lithuania, Russia and Livonia, in which, maintaining the ancient claims of Moscow, he designated himself "by the grace of God, Metropolitan of Kieff and all Russia," and proclaimed the union concluded with Rome. But he was afterwards arrested in Moscow by Wassitz, and after two years fled thence to Rome, and Russia remained closed to the union. But in the Greek Church the union, dictated by the political needs of the Emperor, aroused the greatest excitement and embitterment. The question whether as early as 1450 a synod, which rejected the union and deposed the Patriarch Gregory III., was held in the Church of St. Sophia, is contested. But it is certain that Gregory III. recognised his position in Constantinople to be untenable, deserted his see and finished his life in Rome, while the promulgation of the union in Constantinople was delayed, and the Feast of the Union was first solemnly celebrated on the 14th December, 1452, in the Church of St. Sophia, in the presence of the Emperor, by Bishop ISIDORE, of Kieff, sent by Nicholas V. and raised to the Cardinalate; which ceremony stirred up to the utmost the resistance of the Greeks. Immediately thereafter Constantinople fell in the conflict with Mohammed II., the conqueror of Constantinople (23rd May, 1453).

CHAPTER THIRD.

The Time of the Ecclesiastical Re-action and the Renaissance.

1. The Papacy from the Middle of the Fifteenth Century till the Reformation.

Sources : BARTHOL. PLATINA (p. 479), from Eugenius IV. to Paul II. a contemporary source. His continuator ONUPHRIUS PANVINUS, in his augmented ed. of Platina, Col. Agr. 1626. The lives of individual Popes and the *Diaria Rom.* in MURAT., *Reper. Ital. scr.* Among the latter especially STEPHANI INFESSURÆ *Diarium* in ECCARD in the *Corp. hist. med. ævi*, Leipz. 1723, I., and J. BURCHARDI *Diar.* (1483-1506) *seu rer. urbanar. commentarii*, ed. L. THUASNE, Par. 1883-85; AENEÆ SYLV. *opp. omnia*, Basil. 1551 *iter.* 1571; ejusd. *de vita et rebus gestis Frider. III.* in KOLLAR, *Anal. Monum.*, Vindob. II., 139; ejusd. *epp.*, Col. 1474, Norimb. 1481 and frequently; cf. G. VOIGT, in the AKOG. VI., Wien 1856; ejusd. *orationes pol. et eccl.* ed. MANSI, Lucæ 1755-59, 2 vols.; ejusd. *opp. inedita*, ed. J. CUGNONI, Rom. 1883.—CIACONII *vite et resg. Pont. Rom. ab Oldoino rec.*, 3 vols., Rom. 1677; CREIGHTON, *A history of the Pap. during the period of the Ref.*, vol. i-iii., London 1882 and 1887; PASTOR, *G. d. Päpste* (vid. I. 20) i. and ii., 1886 and 1889; G. STORZA, *Nic. V.* in German by HORACK, Innsbr. 1888; KAYSER in Jgg. vi.; G. VOIGT, *Enea de' Piccolomini als Pius II. u. s. ZA.*, 3 vols., Brl. 1856-63; F. GREGOROVIVS, *Lucr. Borgia*, 3rd ed., 2 vols., Stuttg. 1876; M. BROSCHE, *Alex. VI. u. s. Tochter* in HZ., vol. 33; C. v. HÖFLER, *Don Rodrigo de Borgia u. s. Söhne*, Wien 1889; CH. YRIARTE, *les Borgia (Césare)*, 2 vols., Par. 1889; M. BROSCHE, *P. Julius II. u. d. Gründung des Kirchenstaats*, Gttg. 1878; id., *G. d. Kirchenst. I.*, Gttg. 1880; ROSCOE, *Life and pontif. of Leo X.*, Liverp. 1804, London 1806, in German by GLASER with notes by HENKE, 3 vols., Lpz. 1808, Wien 1818.

NICHOLAS V., the promoter of the now strong humanist tendency, and founder of the Vatican Library, lived to see the conquest of Constantinople, and now summoned a crusade and ordained an ecclesiastical tithe for that purpose. But the profound excitement of men's minds over that event nevertheless failed of a corresponding result. The princes and powers remained entangled among their nearest and conflicting interests; at the German Diet it was thought that the Pope and the Emperor merely wanted money, and support against the Turks was conceded to the Hungarians only. Even in Rome shortly before the catastrophe opinions differed on the question whether assistance ought to be afforded to the heretical Greeks.¹ Nor was the zeal of the restless CALIXTUS

¹ *Vid.* the memorial of December, 1452, in FROMMANN, l.c., page 426 sqq.

III. (Alf. Borgia, 1455-58) able to rouse men to action. Charles VII. forbade the preaching of the crusade in France, and only conceded an ecclesiastical tithe under reservation of the rights and liberties of the French Church; but many of the clergy and the university of Paris appealed against it to a general council. In Germany the princes, in the fore rank the Archbishops of Mayence and Trèves, wished to utilize the opportunity to make the recognition of the Pope and complaisance towards his demands conditional on the renewal of the liberty of the Church—a kind of pragmatic sanction *i.e.* really to take political and financial advantage of the occasion. However, the Emperor Frederick III., advised by Aeneas Silvius, did homage to CALIXTUS III. without further question, and the German opposition remained mere complaint, such as was raised by Martin Mayer,¹ the Chancellor of Mayence, and Aeneas Silvius sought to refute in the treatise *De ritu, situ, moribus et conditione Germaniæ*, in accordance with the standpoint of the decided papal system which he had already adopted. For this Aeneas was made a cardinal, and Calixtus explained pretty plainly to the Emperor that the observance of the Concordat depended on his good pleasure.

After the death of Calixtus, Aeneas himself succeeded to the papal See as PIUS II. (1458-64), witty, learned, shrewd, and energetic, a frivolous humanist worldling, who threw himself into the interests of the restored Papacy with the same adroitness as he had formerly into those of the Council. Only moral inspiration was lacking to this diplomatic Pope. Opposition to the Turks obviously occupied the front rank among the interests of a pope. But the attempted foundation of new knightly orders was of no duration. At the **Congress of Princes at Mantua** (1459), which was laboriously brought about and sparsely attended, he obtained from a few powers the promise of help in the matter of the Turks, but amid the diversity of political interests indifference prevented any common action from being taken. A didactic letter to Sultan Mohammed II. (1461) naturally remained without effect. Subsequently he wished to place himself at the head of a crusading army, for which purpose the Roman alum-bed discovered in 1462 was to supply the means. But only tardily were a few Venetian vessels found for the enterprise. Then, in 1464, he was called away by death.

More important for him was the establishment of the papal authority which had been shattered by the period of the Councils. He declared indignantly against the principles of Kostnitz and Bâle,

¹ Letter to Aen. Sylvius of 31st August, 1457.

which he had once so vigorously defended, and forbade, on pain of excommunication, appeals from the Pope to a council, to which it was now the custom to resort frequently. The mission of Cardinal BESSARION to Germany for the sake of promoting the enterprise of the crusade only gave rise to a letter of complaint by the German princes, and an appeal of the above sort. Duke SIGISMUND of AUSTRIA, who was laid under ban and interdict on account of acts of violence against the obtruded Bishop of Brixen, Nicholas of Cusa, appealed in like manner. GREGORY of Heimburg, the tenacious opponent of the Pope, defended his cause, but for that reason was himself placed under the ban. Archbishop DIETHER, of Mayence, who at the electoral Diet at Nuremberg appealed to a council against the enormous annate required of him, was arbitrarily deposed by Pius, in 1461, as the centre of the German opposition party; but the conflict which was thus originated closed with an agreement by which Diether abdicated in return for important concessions. In France, Pius sought to set aside the Pragmatic Sanction, against which he had already ardently declaimed at Mantua as a stain upon the Church. CHARLES VII. appealed without hesitation against this action, but his successor, LEWIS XI., agreed in 1461 to the abolition of the Sanction, in order to gain the favour of the Pope for the claims of the house of Anjou on Naples. But when Pius, in the interest of a nephew whom he favoured, did not accede, Lewis willingly allowed the parliament to refuse to abolish the Pragmatic Sanction and the unstable condition of the Church to continue. In Bohemia, GEORGE PODIEBRAD, on his coronation, had vowed fidelity and obedience to the Church and the Pope from political considerations, and had promised to exert himself to bring back his people from all errors; and Pius had diplomatically satisfied himself with this secretly given promise, which he now interpreted as abandonment of the Compacts, while GEORGE PODIEBRAD already sought to maintain them for the sake of the influence of the Utraquists. In the next few years neither George nor Pius was in any way inferior in the moves of diplomacy. After vain pressure, Pius, in 1462, declared the Compacts annulled, and cited the king to answer for himself at Rome. The document was already written when Pius died. The opposition was heightened under his successor, PAUL II. (1464-71). PODIEBRAD'S ambitious plans drew him now to this side, now to that. In December, 1466, Paul declared him deposed, and in 1468 incited king MATTHIAS of Hungary to war against Podiebrad, who was entangled in far-reaching political plans, but did not attain the

desired end; for when Podiebrad died, soon after the influential Rokyzana (1471), the Polish prince WLADISLAV, who was now elected, was obliged to swear to maintain the Compacts.

For the popes who now followed, the determining interest is that of maintaining and utilizing their political position. Family interest and a self-seeking policy, often faithless, and free of all moral considerations, make use according to circumstances of the spiritual weapons of their rank. Francis de la Rovere, the general of the Franciscans, was raised to the Papacy as SIXTUS IV. (1471-84), a great patron of art, and at the same time a powerful ruler, but a reprobate. He was involved in a share of the guilt of the conspiracy of the Pazzi against the Medici in Florence, then combated Florence by means of the interdict, and imposed the ban on Lorenzo, who had escaped the massacre and had been recalled by the Florentines. But the Florentine clergy appealed again to a council and declared the ban and interdict invalid. Altered political circumstances and the conquest of Otranto by the Turks compelled Sixtus to give way. Soon thereafter he sought to provide otherwise for his nephew Girolamo Riario, and in league with Venice attacked Duke Hercules of Este. Then he suddenly shifted to the opposite party and in turn laid Venice under ban and interdict. After his death the capitulation of election was intended to afford protection against nepotism. But the newly elected INNOCENT VIII. (1484-92) practised it more keenly than ever in the interest of his numerous children, and the cardinals were in no way behind him in this matter. While Innocent issued summons in ancient fashion to the crusade and for the Turk tax, he held the brother and rival of Sultan Bajazid, Dschem (Zizim, Zemes), who had come into his power through the knights of Rhodes, prisoner for a high ransom, which the Sultan paid him. Under him, Germany, with the Pope's sanction, was blessed with the institution of trial for witchcraft (*vid. infra*). Elected by the cardinals, corrupted by bribery, Roderick Borgia (Borja), a nephew of Calixtus III., now exhibits as ALEXANDER VI. (1492-1503) the deepest degeneracy of the Papacy, the stifling of all spiritual motives by political interest in the conflicts of the Italian peninsula. Every vice, especially lust, murder in the interest of political passion, and avarice, was practised in Rome, and with the greatest mastery in the family of the Pope. When CHARLES VIII. of France sought to assert the rights of his house of Anjou over Naples, FERDINAND of Naples and his son ALPHONSO II. retained the Pope on their side by great gifts to his sons. Alexander threatened Charles with the ban, and seems himself to have looked about for

Turkish assistance.¹ When, however, Charles made his entry into Rome, Alexander had to adopt his party and deliver up the imprisoned Dschem, whose death shortly afterwards was ascribed to his having been poisoned by Alexander. Alexander then allied himself with the Emperor MAXIMILIAN and Spain, to be rid of France in Italy; finally he again approached Lewis XII. who had succeeded Charles VIII. Alexander loosed his favourite son, Cardinal CÆSAR BORGIA (the murderer² of his brother Giovanni, the Duke of Candia) from his spiritual rank, in order that he might pursue his secular plans without hindrance. In gratitude for Alexander's action in granting the divorce of Lewis of Orleans from his wife, in order that he might marry the widow of Charles VIII., he, as Lewis XII., made Cæsar Duke of Valentinois, and supported him in the formation of a central Italian principedom by violence and treachery. The church government of this Pope appears merely as the source of financial means for the maintenance of the luxurious and dissolute court and the pursuit of political ends. He died in 1503, as is conjectured, by poison.³ In the strongest contrast with this reprobate Pope stands the lofty form of the Dominican Prior of S. Marco in Florence, GIROLAMO SAVONAROLA.

In his sermons on repentance, which were of powerful effect, he held forth their vices to all ranks, demanded thorough reforms of the whole Church and clergy and rose to the **idea of a national regeneration of Italy in religion and morals**, of which he conceived the restoration of the republican freedom of Florence as the starting point. The way was to be prepared by a divine judgment to be expected on Italy. Political affairs, the expulsion of PIERO DE' MEDICI, and the interference of CHARLES VIII. of France promoted in Savonarola the religious-political tendency which led him to the clear expression of the idea of a **democratic-republican theocracy**, in which the will of God, the fear of God, and piety were to dominate all private and public affairs. For a considerable time, as prophet and theocratic leader, he was actually the most influential man in Florence. Amid the vigorous resistance of the luxurious and highly cultured nobility, with their loose morality, he was able to induce worldlings through moral agitation to break suddenly with luxury, voluptuousness, and refined worldliness, and the populace, carried away by his influence, burned all their frippery and all the instruments of luxury, but also works of art and the writings of Boccaccio. But the theocratic ideal soon declined, and Savonarola fell a victim to the fickle popular spirit, from the time that Alexander VI., the hierarchy, and the other orders proceeded against the bold Christian demagogue. Savonarola was burned on the 23rd May, 1498, as a heretic, a persecutor of the Church and seducer of the people. But his Order

¹ *Vid.* H. HEIDENHEIMER in ZKG., V. 511 against the doubts expressed by RANKE and BROSCH.

² This also is controverted, though hardly with justification.

³ He himself or his son Cæsar is said to have mixed the poison for another. But the point cannot be strictly proved.

always maintained his innocence and blamelessness as a churchman, even after Luther had canonized him, in spite of the Pope and all papists. In spite of the monastic one-sidedness of his ideas of reform, his zeal was supported by deeper views of the faith, which Luther could understand in his own sense. In Savonarola's **Meditations** on the li. and xxxi. psalms, written in prison shortly before his death, and which Luther edited with a preface (*vid. opp. var. arg.* vii., 493), it was the assurance of faith, which in face of death broke through all ecclesiastical and monastic prejudices, and rested solely on the free divine mercy without regard to merit by works, which Luther found here, as in so many cases of mediæval piety. The monstrous apostasy of the "modern" Church from the apostolic ideal necessarily led Savonarola to break through the Roman conception of the Church. Christendom, he said, had to-day become a Jewish people, the true Church had been destroyed and a false one built of Christians who were material for the fire of hell. The elect who are in a state of grace are the true Church. In the last and supreme resort they are not bound by external ecclesiastical power, where it appears plainly unchristian; by its unrighteous ban they cannot be cut off from Christ. "If Christ absolve thee not, then what avail thee all other absolutions? Christ says: I will stand by those who are accursed, and the devil stands by those who are blessed. Those are not cut off from Christ, who bear his death in their mortal bodies." Equally certain of his vocation as a reformer, as of his gifts as a prophet, Savonarola summoned the princes to call a general council, to release Christendom from an Alexander VI.—*Opp.* Lugd. 1633–40, in 6 vols. His sermons, mostly taken down by hearers, Flor. 1496 sqq. Among numerous tractates often edited singly: *Trionfo della croce*; *Compendio di rivelazioni*. *Vid.* his devotional writings, in German by RAPP, Stuttg. 1839; P. VILLARI, *Storia di Gir. S.*, 2 vols., 2nd ed., Fir. 1887 (the first edition, 1853, already utilized by K. HASE, *Neue Propheten*, 2nd ed., 1861; translated into German 1868);¹ RANKE, *Sav. u. d. florent. Republik* in his *hist. biogr. Studien*, 1877 (Works, vol. 40); A. GHERARDI, *Nuovi Documenti e studi int. a Gir. S.* 1887.

After the short pontificate of Pius III. (September–October, 1503), who had promised a General Council in his capitulation of election, Giuliano della Rovere was raised to the pontificate as JULIUS II. (1503–13), the Pope of art, war and politics who expelled Cæsar Borgia and sought to separate parts of the State of the Church from over-powerful Venice. He concluded with the Emperor Maximilian, Lewis of France, and the King of Naples the **League of Cambray** (1508), against Venice, but subsequently, in opposition to France, which was pressing threateningly into Lombardy, gladly made peace with Venice, which humbled itself, and now advanced against France. Under these circumstances, Lewis, who in 1499 had already again declared the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438 legally valid, once more fostered the ecclesiastical opposition. When the Pope conferred a French bishopric, Lewis stopped the revenues of all holders of French and Milanese benefices who resided with the Curia, and caused a National Council to be held in Tours (1510),

¹ [English translation, London 1890.]

which demanded a General Council and some sort of representative body for the exercise of papal functions during the quarrel. This also occasioned the revival in Germany of the old accustomed complaints and demands. Germany, in consequence of the unfortunate issue of the Concordat, had in special measure become a financial source for the Curia. In order to stave off serious reforms, the popes had preferred to concede rights and privileges in their national churches to the Emperor and the more powerful German territorial princes. While, therefore, the Pope was unremitting in his exertions to increase under all sorts of titles his revenues from the national churches, the national rulers strove no less to increase their influence and privileges in the Church, so that on both hands the real interest of ecclesiastical reform fell into the background; the complaints of the German Estates of the Empire as to Roman practices continued without intermission, partly in connection with the efforts after reform of the constitution of the empire. Here there was no longer any question of opposition to the papacy on principle, but of a bargain between the two parties over the limits between papal interference and princely government. The greater secular authorities of Germany had gradually obtained very considerable concessions, and it was now hoped in regard to the empire also that it would be possible successfully to relieve the general German complaints of excessive burdens imposed by the Pope (annates, taxes, expectancies, reservations). The Emperor MAXIMILIAN caused the humanist WIMPFELING to lay before him an opinion on the subject of reform, and soon thereafter attached himself to the anti-papal efforts of France, although he at the same time (1511) also entertained the adventurous plan of becoming pope himself if the sick Pope should die.¹ French clergy contrived to arrange a Council for which three cardinals furnished the invitation by subscribing their names.

The Council was to meet in **Pisa** in September, 1511, bring about a general peace among Christians and a war against the Turks, and effect the reformation of the Church in head and members, and the abolition of all defects in ecclesiastical life.² Pope JULIUS responded on his side by convoking a General Council to the Lateran for the following year, concluded a league with Spain and Venice, and condemned the intended Council at Pisa. It was opened by a handful of French prelates under the presidency of Cardinal Ber-

¹ On this subject *vid.* the writings of JÄGER, W. BÖHM, 1877, and H. ULMANN in ZKG., III. 2, and *id.*, *K. Maximil.'s I. Absichten*, Stuttgart. 1888.

² P. LEHMANN, *Das pisan. Conc. v. 1511*, Brsl. 1874.

nardo CARVAJAL, and repeated the declaration of Kostnitz as to the authority of councils. But its powerlessness was clear from the very beginning. A popular revolt compelled it as early as December to go to Milan under the protection of French arms. Germany held back entirely, and Maximilian even allowed himself to be drawn over to the papal league, and declared his adherence to the Lateran Council. In April, 1512, the Council of Pisa still ventured to suspend the Pope. But when the fortunes of war turned against the French, it retired to Lyons and gradually dissolved. On the other hand, Julius II. celebrated the triumph of gaining expression for the papal claims at his Council, which was acknowledged by Spain and England, and afterwards by Germany,¹ but only attended by pliant Italians. The famous theologian THOMAS DE VIO (CAJETANUS) defended the supremacy of the Pope over the whole Church and the Council, which only derived its right from the Pope, as well as the Pope's infallibility. After Germany had also declared its obedience, Julius issued the interdict against France, rejected the French ecclesiastical constitution, and summoned the French clergy to answer for themselves in Rome. Soon thereafter he died, and his successor, Giovanni Medici (the son of Lorenzo the Magnificent), as LEO X. (1513-21) brought the remainder of the rival Council into humble submission. LEWIS XII. was reconciled to the Pope, and his successor, FRANCIS I. (from 1515), reached out his hand to abolish the Pragmatic Sanction, and concluded a concordat with the Pope, by which the Pope and the King divided the liberties of the Gallican Church.

The free election by chapters was abolished, and the higher ecclesiastical dignities were handed over to the papal nomination; the annates and other ecclesiastical revenues were awarded to the Pope, but the King was to have a right of proposal for that nomination, which came pretty near to royal nomination, and of these revenues a considerable portion was to fall to the crown. While these advantages practically handed over the French Church to the crown and made it a political interest of the French kings to maintain the condition of the Church unharmed, Rome had the satisfaction of burying in the Pragmatic Sanction the last remainder of what had been gained at Bâle.

In the Bull *Pastor æternus* the Pope and the Council confirmed the full sovereignty of the Pope over councils with express citation of Boniface VIII.'s notorious Bull *Unam sanctam*. One single voice resisted in the vote on the revocation of the resolutions of Bâle and Bourges. All the rest gave their *placet*, Leo himself in the words: *non solum placet, sed multum placet et perplacet*. And this Pope,

¹ The embassy of Maximilian's minister, MATTHIAS LANG, Bishop of Gurk.

who thus again constituted himself a second God on earth, was indeed a highly educated man and a sagacious and expert man of business, but his spirit and heart were not in the ideal of the Church, but in art and humanist science, without any hearty personal participation in the Christian faith; he therefore constituted the mediæval papal ideal, without any of that enthusiasm for the faith, which had permeated a Gregory VII. and an Innocent III. Characteristic is the dogmatic decree of the Council, which still found it necessary to acknowledge the immortality of the soul.

Here, just before the birth hour of the Reformation, stands the apparently complete victory of papal absolutism, but deserted by the spirit. It is true that this Council also took in hand the constantly desired reformation of the Church, to which it had been summoned in the striking preaching of repentance of the famous Augustinian General AEGIDIUS of Viterbo; but the reforming decrees were confined to the inculcation of the precepts of the Church relative to filling benefices with really suitable spiritual persons, a few ordinances for the strengthening of the episcopal supervision and episcopal censorship of books, and so provided no mitigation whatever for the old abuses in the papal government of the Church which were so severely felt by the German nation, much less did they touch the inward mischiefs or give an impulse to the revival of the religious spirit. The Council also summoned believers to a crusade against the Turks, ordered a crusading tax from all countries, issued a papal indulgence for that purpose, and imposed a tithe on the clergy. A minority had demanded that the tax and indulgence should not be ordered and issued till the undertaking was in progress. After the solemn close of the Council (16th March, 1517), the Spanish clergy, under the leadership of the famous Cardinal Ximenes, refused to pay the tax before that took place. England would have nothing to do with the matter, and in Germany the Diet of Augsburg (1518) utilized the old complaints against Rome to repel the new demands. (B. GEBHARDI, *die Gravamina der deutschen Nation*, Berl. 1884.)

2. Humanism and the Secular Culture of the Renaissance.

Literature: G. VOIGT, *die Wiederbelebung des Klass. Alterthums*, 2nd ed., 2 vols., Berl. 1880 sq.; J. BURCKHARDT, *die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien*, 4th ed., by L. GEIGER, 2 vols., Lpz. 1885; L. GEIGER, *Renaissance u. Humanismus in Italien u. Deutschland*, Berl. 1882; W. GASS, *Gennadius u. Pletio*, Bresl. 1844, (*Beiträge I.*); FR. SCHULTZE, *Gesch. d. Phil. d. Renaiss.* I., Jena 1874; H. VAST, *le cardinal Bessarion*, Par. 1878; A. v. REUMONT, *Lorenzo de' Medici, il Magnifico*, 2nd ed., 2 vols., Lpz. 1888; J. VAHLEN, *Lor. Valla*, Berl. 1870; K. HARTFELDER, K. CELTES, *HZ.*, vol. 47; F. v. BEZOLD, *ibid.*, vol. 49; J. ASCHBACK, *der Wiener Univ. u. ihre Humanisten*, W. 1877; L. GEIGER, *J. Reuchlin*, Lpz. 1871; A. MÜLLER, *Leben d. Er.*, Hamb. 1828; F. O. STICHARD, *E. v. R.*, Lpz. 1870; F. SEEBOMM, *the Oxford Reformers of 1498*, 2nd ed., Lond. 1861; Th. B. DRUMMOND, *Er., his life and char.*, 2 vols., Lond. 1876.

A great intellectual power of a secular character now comes alongside of the ageing Church. In the West, during the flourishing period of ecclesiastical life, the knowledge of classical literature,

never extinguished, though at times somewhat limited, remained hampered in its influence on the free development of intellect and taste by the preponderance of the positive doctrine of the Church and the fixed forms of scholasticism. It was only in the period of the Church's decline that it entered upon an increase of activity, and, along with the issue of the efforts of the great Councils, brought about—first of all in Italy—a new period of culture. Of the great Italians, Dante (†1321), Petrarch (†1374), and Boccaccio (†1375), in whom Italian national poetry kindled into flame, the first, the author of the *Divina Comedia*, along with his deep piety and enthusiasm for the faith of the Church and his essentially scholastic culture, already exhibits an inclination towards classical ideals. Petrarch became the founder of Latin Humanism and the zealous imitator of the ancients (*epistolæ*); Boccaccio, the first Italian prose writer, was at the same time a zealous promoter of classical studies (*de genealogia deorum*) and the representative of wanton wit and the derider of the monks and clergy. It is Roman classical culture which is here specially fostered, in the cause of which, *e.g.*, John of Ravenna worked as teacher in Padua and Florence in the beginning of the fifteenth century. Classical rhetoric and the cultivation of style begin to be prized at the Curia, as is shown by Nicholas of Clemanges and many others, *e.g.* Poggio (papal secretary at the Council of Constance). The **Byzantines** from of old had command of a much richer treasure of classical, and especially of Greek, learning, and their influence on the West now constantly increased. Immanuel CHRYSOLORAS shows this influence as early as the end of the fourteenth century. The Council of Union at Florence (1439) brought close contact and an influential intermediary in BESSARION, a man of classical culture. GEORGIUS GEMISTHUS PLETHO, who had given his advice against the union with the Latin Church, but, nevertheless, took part in the negotiations and worked for a time in Italy (Florence), introduced a new leaven into the movement by his enthusiasm for Platonic philosophy. To him Plato was a free antique intellectual force, which he led into the field against Aristotle, who was sheltered by the Church and was her traditional servant. In his conflict with GENNADIUS and other defenders of Aristotle he at the same time leads the cause of a religious culture, free from the narrow forms of dogma, in which the classical and ecclesiastical were to be ideally blended, and Bessarion, his pupil, shares his standpoint, but in a modified manner, determined by regard for the Church. After the fall of Constantinople, numerous Greek scholars, although mostly unimportant, brought

the Byzantine treasures of antiquity to Italy, where Rome and the Florence of the Medici became gathering points for the revival of the classical world. At first without express reference to the Church and theology, the representatives of this classical tendency had not only to combat the form of scholasticism; the dogmatism and traditionalism of the Church had also to submit to historical criticism, and the study of language had to be applied to the Holy Scriptures. LAURENTIUS VALLA (†1457) wrote his *annotationes in novum testamentum*, practised philological criticism on the Vulgate and historical criticism on the so-called *Donatio Constantini*. The Inquisition scented the danger to the Church in this new intellectual force; but Pope NICHOLAS V., the zealous patron of humanist studies, took Valla under his protection. For the most part the Church was left untouched directly, but there was developed a tendency of spirit and taste on a basis perfectly independent of the Church, here and there to the extent of a perfectly Pagan view of life. In Florence, under Cosmo de' Medici, a Platonic Academy was formed, at the instigation of Gemisthus Pletho. MARSILIUS FICINUS (†1499) translated Plato into Latin, and there was here developed a syncretistic Neoplatonism, which could still adhere with credence and even credulity to Christian elements. The young Count JOHANNES PICUS, Prince of Mirandola, a universal genius, included the Kabbala in his effort after universal knowledge, and excited admiration but also sensation and hesitation by his 900 theses. But the free impulse of humanism opposed a genuine Aristotle to the sophisticated Aristotle of scholasticism, and to the Platonic Academy a peripatetic school in which a strong sceptical tendency became dominant. PIETRO POMPOZZO (†1526), while outwardly submissive to the Church, regarded the immortality of the soul, divine providence and such questions as in philosophy merely very doubtful problems. Among many of these humanists, *eloquentia*, i.e. the slavish imitation of the style of the ancients, was regarded as the acme of culture; men in high ecclesiastical dignities (Paulus Cortesius, Cardinal Bembo and others) lived among the images of the old mythology and often applied them in ludicrous fashion to the rhetorical paraphrasing of matters belonging to the Church's faith. Minds bewitched by the classical world fell away into religious unbelief and moral frivolity and took delight in the most shameless lascivities of Latin poetry, while they looked down contemptuously on the barbaric schoolmen. But classical studies, supported by the free and luxurious life of Italy, also formed a chief factor in the rising life, specially the artistic, and in the secular culture, of the Renaissance.

The flourishing period of the Church had brought the **Romance** style of architecture to its full development, and out of it had developed the **Gothic** (pointed-arch) style, as the perfect expression of the awe and reverence of the Christian Spirit, in which a sensuous form was given to the transcendentalism and mysticism of the Christian faith and at the same time, amid all the variety of local character (Norman, French, English, German), to the universal world-dominant power of the Church. In this process the art of building had passed out of the monasteries into the hands of laymen. The corporations of the lodges of the Freemasons, had in strict alliance kept the secrets of the technique of their art and placed them at the service of the Church and finally also of the rising cities. Now, while the Gothic style remained in use elsewhere for building churches, in Italy, where—under the influence of the monuments of antiquity—Gothic had never become so universal and so genuinely at home, the humanist tendency of the spirit of the age led to a conscious attachment to the antique. The **Renaissance style** was formed under these influences from the time of BRUNELLESCHI († 1444). Antique models proved fruitful in promoting the pursuit of plastic art, which in the thirteenth century had already begun to bestir itself in the service of the Church (NICOLÒ PISANO, † 1274). Painting, which with GIORIO († 1334 in Florence) had still been very dependent on Byzantine forms, had gained through Fra GIOVANNI ANGELICO da Fiesole a new and subjectively freer life from the inspiration of the cordial and devout spirit which proceeded from S. Francis, and the unfettering of men's minds led, from the beginning of the fifteenth century, to delight in rendering nature, and realistic apprehension of the human form and actual life (MASACCHIO, † 1428). Fertilized by antique works of art and ideas, **painting** placed mythological pictures alongside of ecclesiastical, and led even in the latter to the assertion of the free artistic spirit, a development which reached its height in LEONARDO DA VINCI († 1519), the powerful and many-sided artist MICHAEL ANGELO († 1564) and RAPHAEL († 1520).

The intercourse of Germans and Italians at the great Councils also worked in favour of the transplanting of humanistic studies to **Germany**, where **Erfurt** and **Heidelberg** were their earliest nurseries. RUDOLF AGRICOLA († 1485) awakened disciples and adherents of humanism everywhere. Classical studies were to promote the knowledge of the Biblical Scriptures. His pupil ALEXANDER HEGIUS, teacher at Deventer, stood in close alliance with the Brothers of the Common Life and worked in the interest of a cordial blending of humanistic learning and Christian piety. In the case of many theologians scholastic theology was associated with humanist efforts, *e.g.* in the case of HEYNLIN VON STEIN in Bâle, others at least were on friendly terms with humanists. Many bishops regarded the new scientific life as a support of their efforts, aiming at ecclesiastical discipline and the deepening of Christian sentiment. The Bishop of Worms, JOHANN VON DALBERG, Curator of the University of Heidelberg, a friend of Rudolf Agricola, stood forth pre-eminently in this sense as a patron of the humanists; he stood at the head of the society of Rhenish scholars founded by

CONRAD CELTES, which applied itself to the history of the fatherland on the basis of humanistic studies. Dalberg also brought to Heidelberg the famous and most fertile German humanist of a serious disposition, JOHANN REUCHLIN (born in Pforzheim in 1455, died in 1522), who early distinguished himself by his knowledge of Greek, and returning as licentiate of laws after a long residence in Paris, settled as an advocate in Tübingen, at the same time taught Greek in the University and served as Councillor to Count Eberhard of Württemberg. In his company he visited Italy in 1482, shone in an elegant oration before Pope Sixtus IV., and came into the closest contact in Florence with the most eminent Italian humanists (Marsilius Ficinus, Pico and others). Granted the distinction of nobility as Eberhard's Councillor and member of the Emperor Maximilian's supreme court of justice, he learned Hebrew from a Jew. Even after Dalberg had brought him to Heidelberg he worked there in the most diverse studies, at Latin poetry, Greek and Hebrew grammar, the history of the world and civil law. It was scientific interest which drove him into the controversy with the converted Jew Pfefferkorn, who wanted to have the Rabbinical books destroyed on account of their blasphemies of Christ. The attacks of the Dominicans, especially of the Grand Inquisitor HOGSTRATEN, caused him sharply to chastise the ignorance and barbarism of the monks, and drew to his side the younger men who were stirred by humanism.

A universal humanist culture procured for DESIDERIUS ERASMUS, of Rotterdam, his absolutely commanding position in the republic of scholars. Born in 1465 and brought up among the Brothers of the Common Life at Deventer and Herzogenbusch, he passed in 1486 into the cloister against his will, was soon freed from enforced confinement, and devoted himself without any definite office to learned leisure. For a time he lived in Paris, afterwards in great esteem and veneration in England and in the Netherlands, finally from 1521 in Bâle, where he died in 1536. Scientifically of the greatest merit for his services to classical studies and thereby indirectly to theology also (Greek New Testament of 1516, paraphrases, edition of the Fathers, etc.), he became the freethinking opponent of the Scholastic method, a scourge of the monks and the lazy clergy, and the enemy of the abuses of the Church, (*Adagia* 1500, *ἐγκώμιον μωρίας*, *colloquia* from 1518). Shy of stormy agitations which threatened to disturb his learned quiet and injure his reputation, he sought to work towards ecclesiastical reforms on the path of the new culture, by promoting enlightenment and returning from formalism to simple truths of religion and morality.

In **England** (Oxford) Humanism found in JOHN COLET a close friend of Erasmus (from 1505 Dean of S. Paul's in London), a representative who was a good churchman but warmly in favour of ecclesiastical reform, especially of the revival of the study of Scripture, and in THOMAS MORE an original thinker who contrasted an ideal picture with the state of affairs in his time in his treatise *Utopia* (*de optimo reipublicæ statu*), which on its religious side sketches the main outlines of a universal natural religious disposition within which only were the positive religions to find room. In **France**, JACOB FABER STAPULENSIS proved his sentiments which were friendly to reform, but by no means disposed to break with the Church, in the promotion of humanistic studies. In Spain the latter found an influential patron in Cardinal FRANCIS XIMENES, the founder of the University of Alcalá (Complutum) and originator of the great undertaking of the Complutensian Polyglot.

The great intellectual revolution of Humanism worked as a fertilizing and emancipating force, as in all departments of life so also in the ecclesiastical and the nearly related sphere of education (Jacob Wimpfeling of Schlettstadt). It also greatly spread the consciousness of the necessity of a religious and moral renewal of the Church by a return to the purer sources of the faith, but did not itself, even in its morally serious representatives, find the real religious source of the renewal.

3. The Theology of the Second Half of the Fifteenth Century.

Literature : K. WERNER (p. 464) ; id., *der Augustinismus der späteren MA.*, Wien 1884 ; LINSENMANN, *Gabr. Biel* in ThQ. 1865 ; D. MATZKE, *die natürl. Th. des Raim. v. Sab.*, Bresl. 1846 ; FR. NITZSCH, *Quæstiones Raymundanæ*, ZhTh. 1889 ; NIC. CUSANUS, *vid. sub.* no. 4 ; C. ULLMANN, *Ref. v. d. Ref.*, 2nd. ed., 2 vols. 1866 ; J. J. ALTMAYER, *les précurseurs de la ref. aux Pays-Bas*, 2 vols., La Haye 1886 ; J. FRIEDRICH, *J. Wessel*, Regsb. 1862 ; DOEDES, in StKr. 1870.

Amid the inflow of so many new forces of the time, GABRIEL BIEL, in Tübingen († 1495), represented in a manner worthy of respect the scholastic theology hitherto received, following the nominalist school of Occam. RAYMOND of Sabunde sought new paths ; he sought to bridge over the chasm between natural and supernatural knowledge which had been produced by nominalism by means of a natural theology, which proved the agreement of the book of the creatures with the Biblical revelation. The theological speculation of Nicholas of Cusa occupied a position apart (*vid. inf.*).

Fruitful tendencies towards the deepening of religion lay in the Mysticism of the Brothers of the Common Life and the theology of a Netherland-German theologian who was in close touch with this circle. JOHN of GOCH (Pupper from Goch in Cleveschen, † 1475), under the guidance of Augustine and Mysticism, repudiated the Church's righteousness of works and its service for reward, and was absorbed in the divine redeeming love, apprehended by faith. JOHN of WESEL (J. Ruchrad from Wesel), from 1450 professor in Erfurt, subsequently in Mayence and Worms, died in prison in

1481, after a recantation extorted from him by the Inquisition. Wesel sharply attacked the ecclesiastical practice of indulgence (*adversus indulgentias disputatio*), which had already been combated, though timidly, by his teacher, JACOB of JÜTERBOGK, and in connection therewith also the authority of the Church to remit the penalties of sins and the external Church's absolute authority and freedom from error. JOHN WESSEL (Gansfort), of Gröningen, an esteemed theologian of scholastic and humanistic culture, designated *lux mundi* in Paris, where he taught for a long period, after a life of varied activity, died at last in silent retirement on the Agnetenberg at ZwoU in 1489.

Luther found great kinship to his own spirit in Wessel's warm grasp of divine unmerited grace by the trust of faith living in love. His idea of faith also gave rise to the spiritualizing of his idea of the Church. Communion with Christ makes the believer in the last resort independent of the decision of the hierarchy, even in regard to confession. He sought to spiritualize and deepen the ecclesiastical doctrine of Purgatory. (FR. WALCH, *Monumenta med. æv.*, Gttg. 1757, 2 vols.)

4. Attempts to Reform Ecclesiastical Morals.

Sources: J. BUSCH, *Chronicon Windeshemense* and *libri 4 de reformatione monaster. quorundam Sax.* (in *Leibnitzii script. Brunswic.*, II. 476 sqq.). Ed. K. GRUBE, *GQ. d. Prov. Sachs.*, Halle 1880; K. GRUBE, *J. Busch, ein Kath. Reformator des 15. Jh.*, Freib. 1881; id., *J. B., Augustinerpr. zu Hildes.*, Freib. 1882; J. EVELT, *die Anfänge d. Bursf. Bened.-Congr.* in *Z. f. vaterl. G. u. Altsk.*, 3rd ed., vol. 3, Münster 1865; Th. KOLDE, *d. deutsch. Augustinercongr. u. J. v. Staupitz*, Gotha 1879; L. KELLER in HTb. 1885; id., *J. v. Staupitz u. d. Anfänge d. Ref.*, Lpz. 1888, *ex contra*: KOLDE, ZKG. VII., 420 sqq.

BENEDICT XII. had already adopted measures against the Benedictines, who were sunk in good living and laziness, but with little success. Voices in reproach of the moral evils of the clergy and monks, and attempts at measures of reform, had not been wanting at the **Great Councils**. But the fathers were themselves too much in the bonds of the ecclesiastical system and its secular interests, to be able to take vigorous and successful measures, or even seriously to desire them. The immorality of the clergy was patent to the eyes of the Councils themselves. AENEAS SYLVIVS treated these matters with humanistic levity, and even GERSON accepted and excused the concubinage of the clergy as a necessary evil of the ecclesiastical system. The complaints of earnest-minded men ceased as little in the course of the two centuries as

did the growing scorn and anger at the coarseness and immorality of the priests and monks, who became a favourite object of wit among the humanists and in popular literature.

The **Brothers of the Common Life** still exercised a beneficent influence in giving depth and vitality to religion and on moral conduct, but entirely within the bounds of catholic ecclesiastical piety, and this influence extended to wider circles. The Council of Kostnitz had taken the Brothers under protection against the attacks of the Mendicant Friars. The **Sister-houses** of the Common Life increased rapidly till the middle of the fifteenth century. But the freer forms of living together led partly to speedy decay or to transformation into the more fixed forms of the life of an Order. The most part went over to the Tertiaries of St. Francis, or adopted the Rule of the Nunnery of Windesheim. The rest were regarded by the people as Beguines. The **Brother-houses** fostered the pious mysticism which was native here and still worked in part as a real spiritual salt. The monastery of Windesheim was supported by the Council of Bale in 1435 in its endeavours to bring back the monasteries to the strict Rule. Thus JOHANN BUSCH, who proceeded from Windesheim, effected reforms not only among the regular canons of his order, but also in other monasteries. As sub-prior of the monastery of Sülte near Hildesheim, he came into relations with the abbot of the Benedictine Monastery of **Bursfelde**, JOHANN DEDEROTH of HAGEN (ab Andagine), and co-operated with him in the formation of the so-called **Bursfeld Union** or Congregation with the object of establishing the Rule of Benedict; for, in the hopeless state of many demoralised monasteries, salvation was at first sought in closer attachment to reformed monasteries. Johann Busch and the Congregation of Bursfeld exercised a far-reaching influence in North Germany. Here there now interfered the work of NICHOLAS Cusanus, who had become Cardinal in 1448, and Bishop of Brixen in 1450, and as legate of Nicholas V. for Germany was active there in the establishment of peace, the visitation of churches and monasteries, and the annihilation of heresy by holding many synods.

This man, who has in recent times been stamped by the Ultramontanes as a true reformer of the Church, unfolded a policy of great importance against many abuses among the clergy and monks, and took steps against many crass superstitions, such as the pilgrimages to the miraculous blood at Wilsnack, which had come into vogue. He also supported the efforts of Johann Busch and the Windesheimers, but in doing so he adhered strictly to the course customary in the Church, preached also on behalf of the Roman Jubilee Indulgence, and in general in accordance with the interests of the restored Papacy, while Nicholas V. himself nullified his modest attempts to take steps against the miraculous blood.

Nicholas of Cusa was a man of versatile spirit and original conceptions, but had little success in attaining clearness of thought. Influences of Scholasticism, Eckart's ideas and those of Neoplatonism, blended into speculation of a somewhat pantheistic tinge, which was accompanied by a strong conviction of the limits of human knowledge; not truth, but only probability was, he said, attainable (*de docta ignorantia*). He regards the Christian religion as the most preferable, but, in all religions he finds individual rays of the truth (*Dialogus de pace seu concordia fidei*). From the time when as a renegade he attached himself to the Curialist policy (1440), he showed himself skilful and zealous in papal business (embassy to Constantinople, Legation in Germany). Opp. 3 vols., Bas. 1565; *De studio theol.* in SCHÖPF, *Aurora*, 1857, 2. Much, including a sketch of reform, in DÜX, *der deutsche Cardinal N.C., und die Kirche seiner Zeit*, 2 vols., Regensburg 1847; his life by HARZHEIM, Trier, 1730; SCHARPFF, *d. Card. u. Bisch. N. v. C.*, Mainz 1843 (unfinished); id., *N. v. C. als Reformator*, Tübingen 1871; DÜX l.c.; STUMPF, *die politischen Ideen N's v. C.*, Köln 1865.

The **Augustinian Hermits** were also caught by similar effort for monastic reform. HEINRICH ZOLTER, commissioned by the General Prior of the Augustinians with the reorganization of the Augustinian convents, as vicar of the General Prior, united a number of reformed convents, to which others also attached themselves. There thus arose the special German (**Saxon**) Congregation of the regular **Augustinian Observants**, who now separated from the Conventuals, and in independence of the Provincial Prior stood under a general Vicar elected by themselves. On this account the General Vicar, ANDREAS PROLES, had to maintain continuous and vigorous conflicts with the Provincial Prior, from whose authority he desired to withdraw, while at the same time his zealous efforts to bring back new monasteries to the observance, and to compel the recalcitrant monks to submit to the Rule even against their wills, were supported by the Saxon ruler of the country (William of Weimar). The General Prior of the Augustinians, JACOB of AQUILA, jealous of the independent attitude of Andreas Proles, abolished the whole institution of the vicariate, and summoned all Observants, under menace of ecclesiastical penalties, to return under their Provincial Prior. Against this Proles appealed to the Pope, and an enquiry held at Halle (1477) decided in favour of the Observants. The zealous champion of monastic reforms was, for the rest, completely partial towards papal doctrine, and a zealous champion of indulgences in particular. His successor in the Vicariate, JOHANN VON STAUPITZ, from 1502 a professor in Wittemberg, brought about the alliance of the German to the Lombard Observants in 1505. The plan of uniting the Saxon Provincial Priorate with the Vicariate, and thereby amalgamating the Observants and the Conventuals

(the Saxon first of all), was not indeed carried out, but the establishment of peaceable relations between the parties was attained.

A similar tendency had procured a growing preponderance and authority in the Franciscan Order for the **Observants** (p. 460), who were recognised at Kostnitz and favoured by Eugenius IV., although the original demands of the spirituals were considerably modified. But they entered with growing ecclesiastical zeal into the service of the popes as opponents of the heretics, especially of the Fraticelli. The celebrated JOHANNES CAPISTRANUS (ob. 1456), General Vicar of the Franciscan Observants, is an outstanding representative of the strictly ecclesiastical, miracle-believing and fanatical spirit of these Observants. On his missionary journeys he made a great impression on the multitude, was celebrated as a miracle-working preacher, but avoided a disputation with Rokyzana in Bohemia. The people ascribed the beating back of the Turkish invasion at Belgrade to his merits.

5. Some Features of Religious Life.

Literature: JANSSEN, *Gesch. d. d. Volk. seit Ausg. d. MA.* I., 14th ed., Freib. 1887; GÖTHEIN, *polit. u. relig. Volksbewegungen vor d. Ref.*, Halle 1878; KAWERAU, *ZWL.*, 1882, H. 4 sqq.; W. WEITBRECHT, *d. relig. Leben d. dtsh. Volkes am Ausg. d. MA.*, Hdlb. 1886; v. BEZOLD, *G. d. dtsh. Reform.* I. (ONCKEN AG.).

It was attempted to remedy the great neglect of the people by increased care for **preaching**.

Individual eminent men worked with great success in the old fashion as wandering preachers. The Spanish Dominican Vincentius FERRÉR (†1419) had preached from 1397 on his missionary journeys over a great part of the West, as far as Scotland and Ireland, with universal respect. The religious convulsion of whole popular masses which was so often produced by the Mendicants, led in his case to the repetition of the **penance by scourging** which had already made its appearance in the twelfth century (p. 419), and which at the time of the great plague (the Black Death 1348-51) became a powerful religious popular epidemic, which excited a great part of Europe with its **troops of Flagellants**. At the end of the fourteenth century they again appeared in Lombardy, and Vincentius Ferrér also made the people who surrounded him flog each other and sing the penitential songs which he composed. Similar excitatory influences proceeded elsewhere also, e.g. in France, from the preaching mendicant friars, in Germany from the work of JOHN of CAPISTRANO, here essentially in the service of ecclesiastical restoration. It was of greater importance, that the need of constantly instructing the people in the German cities was met by the appointment of special preachers in the chief churches, a task which was specially undertaken by the Augustinian monks. The custom of regular preaching on Sundays, now becoming more general, is attested by the appearance of great numbers of means of assisting the preparation of discourses, sermon-magazines and the like, and the great number of editions of many favourite collections in the fifteenth

century, e.g. the *Postillæ majores* of the Parisian theologian GUILLERMI (in 75 editions down to 1500), the sermons of the Dominican J. HEROLT and the *Dormi secure* of the Minorite J. VON WERDEN. The **Fast Sermons** which had made their appearance in Italy (since the thirteenth century), became popular in Germany in the fifteenth century; the **Quadragesimale** of the Bâle Minorite J. GRITSCH was printed twenty-six times down to 1500. Towards the end of the period there is an increased need of homiletical directions (ULR. SURGANT, *Manuale curatorum*, 1502; Hier. de DUNGERSHEIM, *Tract. de modo prædicandi*), which in the valuable **Ecclesiastes** of ERASMUS, (ed. Klein, 1820) rises under the influence of humanism to the rank of a spiritual rhetoric. At the same time, preaching partly remained under the curse of dry scholastic formalism and sterile learning, partly it merely afforded amusement by means of insipid legends of the saints and promoted the grossest superstition; or it enchained the popular interest by burlesque jokes and drolleries. A much admired example in regard to the last point is the Dominican Friar GABRIEL of Barletta (in the Neapolitan domain) whose drastic popular humour dramatically enlivened his sermons on repentance directed against moral frailties; *opp.* translated from the Italian into Latin, Brescia 1497 and frequently; WOLTERSDORF in *ZpřetTh.*, 1886. The Franciscans Ollivier Maillard (†1502) and Michael Menot (†1518) worked in a similar spirit on French soil. An attractive picture of the greatly blessed work of the Brothers of the Common Life is given in the sermons of JOHANN VEGHE. He was rector of the Brother-house at Münster, finally of the Sister-house of Niesing there, was in intercourse with Dutch and Westphalian humanists (J. Montanus, Hermann v. d. Busche and Mummellius), and died in 1504. The sermons preached before the Sisters in Niesing are so-called Collations, not artistic sermons, but edifying addresses in a free form, such as were usual in these circles, simple, popular, aiming at the practical exercise of piety and at popular comprehension (JOHANN VEGHE, *ein deutscher Prediger des 15. Jh.*, edited by FRANZ JOSTES, Halle 1883). The famous Strassburg preacher GEILER VON KAISERSBERG (†1510), a friendly associate of the humanist scholastic WIMPFELING and the German satirist SEBASTIAN BRANT, was able to gain fresh life for preaching and to free it from the chains of Scholasticism, and make it serviceable to the religious necessities of the people. Without attacking the doctrines of the Church, he, in a powerful and often drastic fashion, held up their sins and faults before the people and roused their hearts and consciences. He preached sermons on Brant's *Narrenschiff* (Ship of Fools), *Opp. sermones et varii tractatus*, Strassb. 1518 and 1521. Details in CH. SCHMIDT in *RE.* IV., 797. F. v. AMMON, *G. v. K.*, Erlangen 1826; L. DARCHÉUX, *un reformateur cathol.*, etc., Paris 1876; CH. SCHMIDT, *hist. littér. de l'Alsace à la fin du XV. siècle*, etc., Paris 1876.

The invention of printing was immediately utilized by the Church to bring the **Church's means of edification** before the people in copious abundance, postils, plenaries, legends of the saints, mirrors of confession, books of holy places and pilgrimages, finally the **Bible in the vernacular**.

The Church had often pointed to the duty of the religious instruction of the people (cf. p. 321, 324). The danger which threatened on the part of the heretics had led to similar inculcations. On Sundays and Feast-Days the priests were to inculcate the creed in church (Synod of Albi, 1254) and examine the laity in confession (Synod of Beziers, 1351). Along with the creed (12 or 14 articles),

the Lord's Prayer and the Ave Maria, the matter of the catechism extends to the two commandments of love, the seven works of mercy, the seven deadly sins, the seven chief virtues, and the seven sacraments. In a single case the ten commandments appear alongside of these (Synod of Lambeth, 1281). In the detailed directions for the clergy of the Synod of **Lavaur** in 1386 (Hefele, VI. 721), the twelve fruits of the Holy Spirit (Gal., V. 22, cf. p. 121) are presented as precepts. From the fourteenth century, however, the **Decalogue** is frequently utilized as a mirror of confession, and the woodcut is a favourite means of assisting edifying religious literature (J. GEFFKEN, *die Bilderkatechismen des 15. Jh.*, Lpz. 1855; GÖBL, *Gesch. d. Katech. im Abendland*, Kempten 1880). Printed sermons (postils), and especially so-called **Plenaries**, are circulated, i.e. the pericopes of the Gospels and Epistles provided with glosses (short sermons) and explanations in German of the particular parts of the mass (ALZOG, *d. dtsh. Plenarien*, Freib. 1874 [Archives of the Diocese], MAYER in Th Q. 1874). Prayer-books and legends of the saints are circulated; popular treatises on "how one ought to dispose oneself for a blessed death" become special favourites. GERSON, in his *Opusculum tripartitum de præceptis decologi, de confessione et de arte moriendi*, had expressed the wish to influence the people on these matters by pictures. In this sense woodcuts, with accompanying text, become popular under the name of **artes moriendi** (Fz. FALK, *die deutschen Sterbebüchlein von d. ältest. Zeit des Buchdrucks bis 1520*, Köln 1890). Numerous examples of devotional literature in VINCENZ HASACK, *d. christl. Glaube des deutsch. Volks beim Schluss des MA.*, Regsb. 1868; FR. FALK, *die Druckkunst im Dienste d. Kirche*, Cöln 1879.

The compilation of Biblical history with other historical and legendary matter, as provided by PETRUS COMESTOR in Paris († 1179) in the *histor. scholast.*, and similarly by the abbeß HERRAD VON LANDSBERG in the *hortulus deliciarum* (ed. by ENGEHARDT, Stuttg. and Tüb. 1818), found imitation in the so-called *Historienbibeln* (of Guiar Moulin towards the end of the thirteenth century; the Low-German Rhyming Bible of Jacob of Maerlant). Attached to these were the Rhyming Legends (cf. K. A. HAHN, *das alte Passional*, Frankf. 1845), translations from the favourite *vitæ patrum*, etc.

Translations of the **Bible itself** into the vernacular had long circulated, especially in France, but whole Bibles remained a luxury of the higher ranks. The **heretics** (Cathari and especially the Waldensians) were the first to lay hold of it as a means of influencing the people. A translation of the Bible *produced* by the Cathari or Waldensians themselves cannot up till now be strictly proved, but the Provençal New Testament of the Lyons MS., assigned to the thirteenth century by FOERSTER (GGA. 1888, 753), was made use of on their part, as is shown by the appended Catharist ritual (L. CLÉDAT, *le nouveau testament traduit au 13. s. en langue provençal*, Paris 1888). The five Waldensian MSS. of the Bible (Paris, Dublin, Grenoble, Zürich, Carpentras), which all represent one and the same translation, can be proved to have been in use among the Waldenses.

The resistance of Innocent III. to translations of the Bible into the vernacular was already caused by their being used in this way on the part of heretics, and likewise the prohibition of the Bible by the Synod of Toulouse (1229). The ecclesiastical disposition to hostility to the surrender of the word of Scripture to the laity could only be increased by WICLIF's great undertaking of the English Bible. Even JOHN GERSON would have hindered its translation into the vernacular, with exception of the moral and historical portions. The **Bohemian** agitations, on the other hand, like the Waldensian, were necessarily of importance

for the spread of translated Bibles. The German Bible of the so-called **Codex Teplensis** (ed. P. Ph. KLIMESCH, Augsb. 1881-84) is not, as L. KELLER would believe, itself of Waldensian origin, but the confession of faith appended to it is that of the Waldensians, and the marginal notes in great part reveal that the owner of the MS. was suffering persecution by the Church.

The invention of the art of printing now immediately leads to the spread of translations of the Bible in France, Italy, Spain, and Germany. In Germany, before the Reformation, there appeared fourteen editions of the Bible (in High-German, besides a few in Low-German), each of which utilized the previous ones. The first Bible is based, with the Teplensian and the Freiberg MS., on one and the same form of the Vulgate text. The later editions, therefore, are not independent translations, but editions altered as to language. The three oldest are anonymous and appeared without note of place and year, without necessarily implying an attitude of opposition to the ecclesiastical authorities. But certainly they appeared as lay undertakings, products of the growing intellectual interest, especially in the cities of the Empire; and they at least re-awakened the old mistrust of the Church. Archbishop BERTHOLD, of Mayence, censured in 1486 the spread of translations of the Bible for the lay world, and forbade them to be printed and circulated, where they were not approved by certain commissaries (*Vid.* BERGER, *la bible française au moyen âge*, Paris 1884; *id.* *les bibles provençales et vaudoises*, in *Romania* XVIII., 353, Paris 1889; BONNARD, *les traductions de la bible en vers. franç. au moyen âge*, Par. 1884. As to the controversy raised by L. RELLER, *die Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien*, Lpz. 1884; on the subject of the Codex Teplensis, *vid.* the writings of KELLER, JOSTES, H. HAUPT, and BORNEMANN (*JprTh.* 1888). G. W. PANZER, *Nachrichten von d. ältesten gedruckten Bibeln*, Nürnberg. 1877; J. M. GÖZE, *Versuch einer Historie der gedruckten niedersächs. Bibeln*, Halle 1775; KEHREIN, *Z. G. der dtshen. Bibelübersetzgn. vor Luther*, Stuttg. 1851; W. KRAFFT, *die deutschen Bibeln vor Luther*, Bonn 1883; W. WALTHER, *die dtsh. Bibelübersetzungen des Mittelalters*, I., Braunsch. 1889).

The newly revived or increased religious feeling in the Church now assumes the character of heightened ecclesiastical reaction. Piety clasps at the multitudinous ecclesiastical means of grace in their greatest degeneracy and most mechanical performance, or seeks to deaden the sense of emptiness by the glow of religious fanaticism. On both hands the reformed congregations of the Mendicant Friars obtain the greatest influence over the people, and by moving sermons on repentance produce momentary contrition and cause great masses to abandon secular and luxurious life. Religious fanaticism also becomes a powerful lever for political enthusiasm. (Savonarola; Joan of Arc;¹ Capistrano and others). In civic life the enormous increase of all sorts of **Brotherhoods** gains importance. Under the patronage of a particular saint they devote themselves to special pious functions and mutually seek a share in meritorious good works.

¹ The connection of this phenomenon with the fanatical spirit stirred up by the reformed Mendicant Friars is shown by SIMÉON LUCE, *Jeanne d'Arc à Domremy, Recherches crit. sur les origines de la Pucelle*, 1886.

The rush to **holy places** and **seats of relics** often assumes an epidemic character, as is shown, *e.g.*, by the pilgrimages to the miraculous blood of **Wilsnack**.

Here, at the end of the fourteenth century, it was alleged that in the ruins of a church which had been burned down, three scorched hosts, each containing a drop of blood, had been found, which immediately worked miracles. The question whether this was truth or a fraud was zealously controverted, pilgrimage thither was forbidden (p. 506), and the whole affair declared a swindle before the Synod of Magdeburg in 1412. The Bishop of Havelberg who favoured the affair out of pecuniary interest, was combated by Archbishop FREDERICK of Magdeburg, and the Provincial Synod of 1451, under the presidency of Nicholas of Cusa (p. 538), forbade the exhibition of bleeding hosts as priestly fraud. But the Bishop of Havelberg, behind whom stood the superstition of the people, carried his point with Nicholas V. in Rome, and the miracle swindle continued to flourish (KAWERAU in *RE.*, XVII. 183). The miraculous blood was also worshipped at **Sternberg** in Mecklenburg since 1491. A priest was said to have sold to a Jew a consecrated host, which, being pierced by the Jew, was said to have bled.

Faith turned with zeal to the **worship of new saints**, especially of S. ANNA, the mother of the Virgin Mary.¹ In France a morbid throng of pilgrimages begins with the **children's pilgrimage** to St. Michel in Normandy in 1457.

A new rôle is now played by the **belief in devils and witches**, which was passionately adopted by the popular fancy.

Even under the Roman Emperors penal laws were issued against magic and sorcery. In the development of Christianity a considerable part of the Germanic heathenism which had been conquered by the Church had been obliged to undergo a transformation and take refuge under this form. Since the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the formerly more ingenuous belief in the devil in the popular fancy had assumed a darker character, essentially in connection with the enhanced conflict of the Church with heresy. The whole of life seemed to be full of constant conflict of the satanic against the heavenly powers. The notion of witches, of diabolic leagues, and diabolic amours, of witches' Sabbaths and the adoration of evil spread powerfully. The Synod of Trèves in 1310 had declared—still with comparative impartiality,—against the superstitions of sorcery. But Thomas of Aquinas already developed the belief in witches dogmatically, and in the *directorium inquisitionis* Eymericus gave explanations as to the sins of sorcery which were to be regarded as heresy. The magic which was punished by the secular authorities as harmful to society, was at the same time regarded from the ecclesiastical point of view as idolatry and blasphemy, and therefore in the closest relationship with heresy. John XXII. would indeed have had inquiring of the devil punished, but would not yet have treated it as heresy. But the Inquisition, which, especially in France, was in the enjoyment of its most flourishing period in the fourteenth century, could not allow this darker field of action to escape it. The famous jurist BARTOLUS (†1357) gave the opinion that witches must be burned. The Inquisition by its gloomy zeal contributed not a little to confirm the dominion of this whole world

¹ KAWERAU, *Caspar Güttel*, Halle 1882, p. 26 sqq.; ZWL. 1882, l.c.

of delusion among the people. As late as 1396 the Parliament of Paris still assigned the trial of witches to the secular jurisdiction. The **great trial of witches at Arras** (1459-1461), which brought alleged **Waldensians** to the stake for witchcraft,¹ aroused public feeling strongly against the Inquisition, and the Parliament of Paris subsequently revised (1491) the trial and overturned the sentences. But meanwhile INNOCENT VIII.'s Bull *Summis desiderantes* of 1484 had given the momentous decision, inasmuch as it censured the resistance of clergy and laity in Germany to the procedure of the Inquisition, and thereby to a certain extent authorized the belief in witchcraft. Strengthened thereby, the Inquisitors, the Dominicans JACOB SPRENGER and HEINRICH INSTITORIS (Krämer), now issued the notorious **Malleus maleficarum** (The Hammer of Witches, 1489), which contains the whole science of witchcraft, and at the same time the whole apparatus for prosecuting witches. Still, there was no lack of men who doubted the existence of witchcraft in general. The doubts of Archduke Sigmund of Austria were answered by the canonist ULRICH MOLITORIS in a prudent statement of opinion, which, however, essentially confirmed the Archduke's doubts. The treatise *Antipalus maleficarum* and others, ascribed to the learned, and humanistically educated Abbot TRITHEMIUS, are themselves too much involved in the secret sciences to afford an impartial judgment. D. HAUBER, *bibliotheca, acta et scripta magica*, 3 vols., Lemgo 1738 sqq.; G. K. HORST, *Dämonologie*, 2 vols., 1818; SOLDAN, *Geschichte des Hexenprocesses*, 2nd ed., by HEPPE, 1879 and 1880; ROSKOFF, *Geschichte des Teufels*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1869.

In contrast to the scruples entertained in many cases against the **system of indulgences**, in practice we have here the most glaring instance of the perversion of the evangelical saving faith.

Clement VI. had already confirmed the theological basis of the theory of indulgence. In immense numbers and for a long time indulgences had been permanently conferred on certain holy places and spiritual performances. But alongside of these, the special papal indulgences which were proclaimed on special occasions, and brought to the individual by special preachers of indulgence, especially the **Jubilee Indulgences** (pp. 344, 487), those for the Turkish war and the building of St. Peter's formed important papal financial speculations, which as such were justly taxed by secular lords and governments (*excoriationes*, *vid.* KOLDE, *Augustiner*, p. 184). They were certainly also eyed askance by the monks and clergy, who feared from them the diminution of the incomes of their monasteries and foundations. But the **Church of Rome** was not disposed to renounce these sources of finance, and churchly theologians undertook their doctrinal vindication, *e.g.* the Augustinian PALTZ (in KOLDE, p. 181). GEILER himself in a modified fashion championed indulgence as a wholesome portion of the Church's care for souls; but the people allowed themselves to be enticed into this pleasant way of salvation without troubling themselves about the prudent precautions of doctrine. The passion for collecting numerous and curious **relics** was specially instigated by the indulgences which were attached to them. The 1010 sacred relics collected by Frederick the Wise for his cathedral afforded an indulgence for a hundred years. The powers of indulgence attached to the relics of the collegiate-church of SS. Moritz and Mary Magdalen at Halle were innumerable, and by their exposure Archbishop Albert of Mayence in 1521

¹ The term "Vauderie" was used to designate witchcraft and league with the devil.

hoped to do good business, when Luther deprived him of this satisfaction. WOLTERS, *der Abgott zu Halle*, 1877.

Thus the undeniable religious improvement of the age and the numerous attempts at a purer religious knowledge are nevertheless indissolubly involved in the worst distortions of the Christian idea, so that it is impossible to speak of a reformation of the Church in the fifteenth century.

A certain marked improvement in the state of the Church certainly took place in Spain, where orthodoxy and fidelity to the Church had become an object of national pride in the course of centuries of conflict with the infidels. The Spanish crown pursued the tendency to territorial development of the Church (limitation of clerical privileges, subordination of the clergy to civic law, appointment to spiritual posts by government, etc.) with much success, and carried it out victoriously at the consolidation of the united Spanish monarchy under FERDINAND and ISABELLA. The Church stood in a position of most decided dependence on the orthodox government, anxious to promote the revival of Christian discipline, and obtained for itself from the Pope extraordinary powers for the reformation of the clergy and monks and had them carried out by MENDOZA, TALAVERA, and especially FRANCIS XIMENES de CISNERO. The dangerous elements, consisting of the converted Moors and Jews, were relentlessly combated by the **Inquisition**, which was confirmed anew by Pope Sixtus IV. in 1478 and is not indeed to be conceived as a purely state institution, but as a papally authorized mixed institution of terrible activity, remaining in the hands of the crown; the burden of the Church's blood-guiltiness is not lessened by this relationship.¹ The exertions under Ferdinand and Isabella, therefore, were directed at the same time to neutralizing the foes of the Church and the Crown at home, to the overcoming of ignorance and want of culture among the clergy and in the monasteries, and to the establishment of a strict ecclesiastical discipline. As a matter of fact they brought about a certain marked improvement in the Spanish Church and ecclesiastical science, a gathering together of the energies of the mediæval church, which however, especially in this close league with the state power, only served to block the way to really evangelical thought and evangelical life.

C. J. HEFELE, *Cardinal Ximenes u. die kirchl. Zustände Spaniens*, 2nd ed., Tüb. 1851; MAURENBRECHER, *Studien u. Skizzen z. G. d. Reformationsz.*, Lpz. 1874; id., *G. d. kathol. Reform.* I., 1880.

¹ J. A. LLORENTE, *hist. le l'inquisit. d'Esp.*, Par. 1815, translated by Höck, Gmünden, 1820, and the literature in PASTOR, *G. d. Päpste* II., 545.

6. The issues of the sectarian movements, the Waldensians and Bohemian Brethren.

Sources and Literature: pp. 391 and 398; L. KELLER (p. 543); H. HAUPT, *Waldensertum u. Inquisition im südöstl. Deutschl.*, Freib. 1890 (ZfGw., I. 2); RÖHRICHT, *Gottesfreunde u. Winkeler am Oberrhein* in *ZhTh.*, 1840; id., *Mitthl. aus d. Gesch. d. evang. K. des Elsass I.*; W. BÖHM, *Friedr. Reiser's Reformation des Kaisers Sigmund*, Leipzig 1876; H. HAUPT, *HTb.*, F. 6., vol. 8, Leipzig 1888; id., *die rel. Sekten in Franken vor d. Ref.*, Wzb. 1882; G. F. OCHSENBEIN, *aus d. Schweiz. Volksl. d. 15. Jh.*, Bern 1881; FRIES, *Patener, Begharden und Waldenser in Oesterr.* in *VokTh.* XI., 1872; WATTENBACH, *über die Inquis. geg. d. Waldens. in Pommern u. d. Mark Brandenb.*, Berl. 1886 (SBrA.). JOACH. CAMERARIUS, *hist. narratio de fratribus orthod. ecclesiis in Bohemia, Moravia et Polonia*, edited by his grandson Ludwig in 1605; GINDELY, *Quellen zur Gesch. d. böhm. Brüder* in *FRA.* II., vol. 30, Wien 1859; J. GOLL, *Quellen u. Untersuchungen z. Gesch. d. böhm. Brüder*, Prag 1878 and 82; PALAZKY, *Gesch. von Böhmen*, vols. 4 and 5; id., *üb. d. Verh. der Waldens. zu d. ref. Secten in Böhmen*, Prag 1869; GINDELY, *Gesch. d. böhm. Br.*, Prag 1868; W. PREGER, *das Verh. d. Taboriten z. d. Waldens. d. 15. Jh.* (ABA. XVIII., 1), Münch. 1887; thereon, LOSERTH, *GGA.*, 1889, No. 12; G. v. ZEJSCHWITZ, *die Katechismen d. Waldens.*, etc., Erlangen 1863; v. BEZOLD, *zur Gesch. d. Husitenthums*, 1874. Cf. further ZKG. X. and XI. index, under *Waldenser* and *Brüder, die böhm.*

In spite of the exertions of the ecclesiastical Inquisition, supported by the secular power, among the heretics repudiated by the Church (sects of the **Free Spirit**, **Beghards**, **Cathari**), the **Waldensians** in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries had specially obtained wide dissemination both in France, the valleys of Piedmont, Italy and also in Germany and the eastern neighbour lands. In Lower Austria at the close of the fourteenth century eleven chiefs of the sect, who belonged to the rank of peasants and manual labourers, collected from various countries (Germany, Poland and Hungary) fell into the hands of the Inquisition, which in general at that time proceeded with severity against the Austrian Waldensians. The **Winkeler** in Bavaria, Franconia and elsewhere are also to be regarded essentially as Waldensians. Their confessors wandered about, celibate and without property, and preached against the Church (worship of images, merit by works and purgatory). The Winkeler attended the church mass formally and also confessed minor offences to the Romish priests. In **Strassburg** 32 members of the sect were seized by the Inquisition and tortured, but in spite of the request of the Dominicans were not burned. Their lives were spared, and they were only banished the city and bishopric.

The **Waldensians**, who were also firmly seated in Bohemia, necessarily came here into close contact with the Hussites, when, after the execution of Hus, the Hussite movement, which at first was only

favoured in the University and among the nobles, penetrated among the lower strata of society also. FRIEDRICH REISER, of Swabia, who belonged to the Winkelers, attached himself in Bohemia to the Hussites, received priestly consecration among the Taborites and accompanied them to Bâle. With the Taborites he afterwards worked as a missionary in Germany as "by the grace of God bishop of the believers who despise the *donatio Constantini*," against the Church which had become a world-power, and in favour of revolutionary socio-political ideas based on "God's ordinance and Christian freedom." In him, W. BÖHM thought to discover the author of the anonymous *Reformatio Sigismundi*, but hardly with correctness.¹

In general, from the beginning of the Hussite movement, a close connection between the Taborites and the Waldensians, chiefly the German Waldensians, is demonstrable. The hypothesis of a determining influence exercised by the Waldensians on the Taborites has been one-sidedly exaggerated by PREGER, and at the same time the recently recognised dependence of Hus and the Hussites on Wiclif has been underestimated. Related currents, which in the one case as in the other proceed from the idea of the non-worldly **kingdom of God**, purely built upon the law of Christ, and combat the church of power, meet in the Taborites in regard to their social and political consequences also.

In **Bohemia**, by the relative strength of the parties, the estates were compelled, for the sake of the unity of the kingdom, to adhere to the *Compacts* and mutual toleration based upon them, even after Pius II. had definitively rejected them (Diet of **Kuttenberg**, 1485, Religious Peace of 1511). This left the nation as a whole under suspicion of heresy. The attainment of an archbishop of Prague, acknowledged by both parties, who should consecrate for both, remained the aim constantly refused by Rome; the Catholic party did not reach a secure ecclesiastical condition, the difficulty was tided over by means of provisional arrangements and repeated papal *indults*. But the **Utraquists**, who managed their ecclesiastical affairs by means of an Utraquist consistory, suffered specially from the want of regularly ordained clergy, as Catholic bishops required candidates to abjure the *Compacts*.

For a long time they were able to procure consecration from willing bishops in Italy, till the Pope put a stop to these proceedings.² AUGUSTINE LUCIAN, Bishop of the island of Santorin (where a Latin bishopric had formerly existed),

¹ *Vid.* KELLER, *d. Ref. u. d. ält. Reformparteien* 1885, 261 sqq.; BERNHARDI in *JLZ.*, 1876; cf. JUNG, *F.R.* in the *Ztschr. Timotheus* II. 1827.

² *Vid.* the complaints of the Utraquist Diet of 1478 in PALACKY, V. 1, 185.

who lived in Italy, went to Bohemia himself in 1482, was joyfully welcomed there by the Utraquists and protected by a league of Utraquist nobles, and allowed himself to be retained there in precarious circumstances till his death (1493). So likewise, PHILIP DE NOVAVILLA, in Modena, titular bishop of Sidon, in spite of Pope Julius II.'s counter regulation, betook himself to Bohemia, and was acknowledged by King Wladislaw (1504) as "Bishop of Bohemia and President of the Utraquist Consistory," but soon fell into conflict with him (+ 1507).

The *unitas fratrum* of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren is to be regarded as the most genuine result of the Bohemian movement. After the destruction of Tabor by George Podiebrad (1453) the scattered remnants of the Taborites combined into a religiously purified community, which renounced forcible means and was related to the fanatical Taborites in the same way as the later Mennonites were related to the turbulent Anabaptists of the first period of the Reformation. ROKYZANA, who, in spite of his accommodation of himself to the Utraquists, had still preserved inward sympathy with the core of the Hussite conceptions, induced the King in 1457 to afford the Brethren admission to the castle of **Kunwald** in his lordship of **Senftenberg**. GREGORY, a relation of Rokyzana, and the pastor MICHAEL at Senftenberg, led the community, to which many Utraquists also attached themselves. The deepest influence proceeded from the writings of the pious Taborite PETER CHELCZICKY (Peter of Chelczic [Cheltschiz]), to which Gregory was directed by Rokyzana himself. Peter shared with Valdez (but also with Wiclif) the rejection of military service and the taking of oaths. "Christian righteousness has nothing to do with secular penal power and honour of office." The Gospel (regarded as the law of Christ) is the sole norm for the "**Brothers of the Law of Christ**." The community of goods involved in the idea was proclaimed at an assembly in the mountains of Reichenau, in the form of the ideal principle, that the rich man has only to administer his goods for his brethren, and that each brother should make his last will according to the law of God. It was maintained that no secular property was due to the priest. The condition of the Utraquists and ROKYZANA's effort to obtain acknowledgment as Primate of the Bohemian Church, led to a breach with the Brethren, who finally separated from Rokyzana. GEORGE PODIEBRAD's policy towards Rome compelled him to become the persecutor of the Brethren. The constitution of the Brethren under their presidents took place at the assembly at **Lhotka**, not far from Reichenbach (1467), in the presence of **German Waldensians**. But the uncertainty as to the legality of their consecration seems to be connected with

the fact, that the pastor Michael of Kunwald had himself consecrated anew by the Waldensian Bishop STEPHEN († 1480 at Vienna at the stake) and consecrated his two companions presbyters. The conflict of opinion continued at the **Colloquies of 1473 and 1478** permitted by King Wladislaw. The need of a sort of legitimizing of their bishop by maintaining the ancient episcopal succession, and on the other hand by election by the Brethren, here sought a compromise. There soon arose two opposed parties—a stricter and a more moderate. The latter was victorious in 1491 at Brandeis, but the elected Bishop MATTHIAS of Kunwald (a simple countryman) overthrew the decision. LUCAS of Prague, a man of the greatest influence, who now came to the front, and who had sought on wide travels for apostolic communities to which they might attach themselves, after his return turned the scale in favour of the more moderate principles promoting the existence of an orderly ecclesiastical system and the recognition of secular order. Matthias retained the episcopal rank (the right of ordination), the judicial office hitherto associated with it was transferred to a certain Procopius, and a close council of the community, of which Lucas was also a member, was instituted. This was a weakening of the abstract principles of the community by accommodation to human order. A small rigorist party (Amosites) held itself apart in the district of Prachin, but fell into decay on account of internal dissensions. The Brethren confirmed their retreat from the original ideal conception, inasmuch as (Synod of 1495) they abrogated the writings of Peter and Gregory so far as they no longer corresponded to their altered convictions. After the death of Matthias the leadership of the union was transferred to four seniors. From the time of the victory of the milder tendency the number of the Brethren increased considerably; they also found powerful protectors in the nobility. The alliance with the Waldensians was renewed by journeys to southern France and Italy. Brethren were witnesses of the death of Savonarola. Writings of Bohemian origin were translated into the Romance dialect of the Waldensians in consequence of this intercourse. Discussions were held on the grounds of separation from the Romish Church, obviously occasioned by the hesitating procedure of the Waldensians in regard to this point. The Bohemian treatise "*Of the Cause of Separation*" has been proved to be the source of a Waldensian tractate. An attempt of Alexander VI. to convert the Brethren by means of Dominicans came to wreck and occasioned the adoption of new violent measures against the Brethren after a long period of rest (1475–1503).

APPENDIX.

The Schismatical Churches of the East and the Roman attempts at Missions and Union.

THE Nestorians (I. 417), or Chaldean Christians, spread Christianity from the Persian Empire into Asia, as far as China. This seems to be remarkably attested by the Syro-Chinese inscription of Si-Gan-Fu of the year 781 A.D. discovered by the Jesuits in 1625, the genuineness of which is now pretty generally acknowledged (cf. NEUMANN in ZDMG. IV., 38, 1850). Under the dominion of Islam too they on the whole enjoyed considerable toleration and found favour with the Caliphs as physicians, secretaries and the like. As the intermediaries of Greek Christian science, they, as also the Jacobites (*vid. inf.*), exercised important influence on the youthful Arabian science. From the time of the building of Bagdad the Nestorian Patriarch also resided there. As late as about 1000 the Arabian chronicler Albironi designates the majority of the inhabitants of Syria, Irak and Chorassan as Nestorians, whose Patriarch (Catholicus) was confirmed by the Caliphs, but was still consecrated in the ancient metropolis of Seleucia. Their activity in eastern Asia is indicated by the fantastically decked out legend, which spread in the West from the 12th century, of a **priest-king Johannes**, who, on the evidence of Barhebræus (1126-1186), has been identified with the UNG-KHAN (Wang-Khan, a Chinese title) of the Tartar **Keraïtes**, who was converted about 1001. But G. OPPERT has identified him with the KUR-CHAN of the **Kerakitai** in modern Manchuria, (C. RITTER, *Erdkunde von Asien* I., Brl. 1832; G. OPPERT, *der Priester Johannes in Sage u. Gesch.*, 2nd ed., Brl. 1870; F. ZARNCKE, *d. Pr. J.*, Lpz. 1879).

The Mongolian rulers refrained from interfering with the wide-spread Nestorian Christianity, as they did in the case of every religion they met. The last Ung-Khan of the Keraïtes, TOLI, whose daughter married Temujin (afterwards called Jenghiz-Khan), was regarded as a Christian. After Jenghiz-Khan had united the Mongolian hordes into a terrible world-power which overflowed the West, and the popes and princes of the West came into contact with them, the Franciscans (John of PIANO-CARPINI), sent by Innocent IV. found the Nestorian priests in the neighbourhood of the Grand Khan OKTAÏ in Karakorum (south of Lake Baikal). At the same time Innocent IV. entered into relation with RABBAN ARA, the Vicar of the Nestorian East, who answered him respectfully, but no permanent alliance with Rome was the outcome. The mission, caused by LEWIS IX. of France, of the Franciscan Wilh. v. RUYSBROEK (de Rubruquis) to the Mongolian Prince SERTAK, whom he likewise found surrounded by Nestorian councillors and priests, and thence further to the Grand-Khan MANGU, was meant to utilize the common interest against the Saracens, and so induce them to adopt Christianity; but the only result was a religious conference, at which Nestorians coped with confessors of Islam, and Ruysbroek with Buddhists, without further result.

In Persia the invasion of the Mongols under HULAGU led to the complete fall of the Caliphate, the conquest of Bagdad, and the separation of Hulagu from KUBILAÏ, who had hitherto been acknowledged as Grand-Khan. At that time twenty-five Metropolitans in East Asia, as far as India proper, still acknowledged

the Catholicos at Bagdad as their spiritual superior. Hard-pressed by the Sultan of Egypt, Hulagu and his next successors sought to ally themselves with the Pope and Christian princes, and apparently approached Christianity. Under the missionary activity conducted from the West Catholic communities were formed in north-west Persia, and Franciscan and Dominican convents arose; in fact, in the new capital, Sultaniëh, there arose an archbishopric. But there were fewer Mongols than Nestorian, Jacobite and Armenian Christians, who attached themselves to the Roman Church. Under Nicholas IV. (1286), and afterwards under Benedict XI., approaches of the Nestorian patriarchs to Rome remained without result, while the Mongol rulers more and more fell to the share of Islam, which was also victorious in the Khanate of Kiptschak (the lands about the Caspian Sea), and likewise in the central Asian Khanate of Deschagatai. From the time of the interruption of the alliance with the East Nestorian Christianity decayed there. Finally, the convulsions under TIMUR-LENK (Tamerlane, 1369-1405) forced the Persian Nestorians into the mountains of Kurdistan.

In **Eastern Asia** KUBILAI KHAN, in founding his Chinese dominion, found Nestorian bishoprics and churches still pretty numerous in China. The journeys of the two Venetians Nicolò and Maffio Polo brought to Gregory X. Kubilai's desire that Christian teachers from the West should be sent him. After the influential action of the (younger) MARCO POLO and his narrative of his journey, Nicholas IV. sent the Franciscan JOHANNES DE MONTE-CORVINO (1291-1328). Met with hostility by the Nestorian Christians, but, favoured by the ruler, he built two churches in Pekin, established Roman worship, converted some 6,000 inhabitants, and translated the New Testament and the Psalms into Mongolian. Clement V. created him Archbishop of Pekin (*Archiepisc. Cambalensis*). A Roman embassy under the Franciscan JOHN OF MARIGNALA shows the continued survival of his creation, while the Mongolian rulers adhered to Buddhism. The overthrow of the Mongols by the **Ming dynasty** (1270) first made an end of Christianity here.

The **Syrian Monophysites**, called Jacobites after Jacobus Baradaeus (I., 431), who found themselves essentially on the same ground with the Nestorians, their dogmatic opponents, were far less favoured by the Mohammedan rulers than the latter. Their patriarch claimed to continue the old patriarchate of Antioch, while Antioch itself remained closed to them under the Greek rule. They frequently resided in **Amid** (**Diarbekr**), later (from 1166), in the monastery of S. Ananias, near **Mardin**. Alongside of the patriarch stood the so-called **Maphrian** (with the right of consecrating bishops) for the Jacobites living east of the Tigris, at first at **Tagrit** on the Tigris, subsequently (twelfth century) at Mosul. The best-known representatives of a scholarly activity which commands respect are DIONYSIUS I. of Telmahar (ninth century), DIONYSIUS BAR SALIBI (twelfth century), and GREGORIUS ABULFARADJ (— GIUS), called BARHEBRÆUS, (thirteenth century).

The **Armenian Church**, after long waverings of the parties at first, had likewise attached itself to the Monophysite doctrine. In Armenia proper (Greater Armenia) the perpetual battle-field between Islam and Byzantium, the Church passed through a comparatively flourishing period under the native ruling race of the **Bagratides** (885-1046) till it again fell into the hands of the Greeks, and finally into that of the Mongols (1242). In Lesser Armenia, which belonged to Asia Minor, and which till the end of the eleventh century was a dependency of Byzantium, there arose about 1080 the independent dynasty of the Rubenites from Cilicia. From this race proceeded Leo II., who, under the influence of

the Crusades, was acknowledged by the Emperor HENRY VI. as King, and crowned in **Tarsus** in 1196 by a Latin bishop.

After the end of the **Bagratides**, MANUEL COMNENUS made the attempt to unite the Armenian Church with the Greek by gaining over Nerses, their Catholicos (1169). In the negotiations at Tarsus (1177), which were thus started, Bishop NERSES, of Lampron, was specially active, but Manuel's death prevented an actual conclusion, and Latin influences now preponderated. Already at the Synod in Antioch (1139), which happened to be in Latin hands, the Catholicos of Armenia was present, accompanied the Roman legates thence to Jerusalem, and showed himself disposed to an agreement with Rome. But at that time the ruling family of **Lesser Armenia** especially formed the main consideration. NICHOLAS IV. negotiated on the subject from 1189 with King HAYTON (Ayton) and his successor, LEO III. After the death of the latter a council of union was brought about in 1307 at **Sis** (Issus) in Cilicia under Archbishop Constantine of Cæsarea, the resolutions of which were confirmed anew against the resistance of many Armenians at the Synod at **Atan** (Adana) in 1316. But the union created was resisted by the feeling of the Church. For that reason the Armenian Bishop of Jerusalem withdrew (1311) from obedience to his catholicos and caused himself to be appointed an independent patriarch by the Egyptian Sultan, Malik Nasr. The majority treated the union as a mere pretence without giving up their peculiarities. On the other hand, JOHANNES of Kerni, in association with the Dominicans, who had gained him over entirely to the Roman point of view, agitated for a thorough Roman union, and one of his adherents, Bishop Nerses of Urmia, became a fugitive on that account, and went to the West. When Leo IV., basing on the ostensible union with Rome, begged help thence against the Saracens, Pope BENEDICT XII., instructed by this Nerses, presented him with a long list of errors and abuses¹ in the Armenian Church, which were first to be abolished. A Synod at **Sis** (1342) exerted itself to abolish the causes of offence, and sent a solemn embassy to CLEMENT VI. In Rome the honesty of the Armenians was not trusted. Finally, when EUGENIUS IV., at the Council of Florence, had issued invitations to the whole East, there ensued on the part of the Armenian Church the adoption of a union with Rome on the basis of the recognition of the Council of Chalcedon, the Roman doctrine of the *filioque*, the seven sacraments and adherence to the Roman celebration of the feasts. The Mesopotamians also, who showed themselves to be Monophysites and Monotheletes, declared for the adoption of Roman doctrine through the emissaries of their Patriarch Ignatius. With a like aim Eugenius sent Archbishop ANDREAS, of Rhodos (Colossensis) to **Cyprus** to make known the union which had been concluded to the Greeks, Armenians and Jacobites there, and to win the Nestorians and Monotheletes.² The results corresponded to those of the union with the Greeks.

¹ *Vid.* HEFELE (Knöpfler), VI. 654. Among the abuses censured are the following, which had their roots in the ancient Church: *intercession* for all saints (I. 506), the transformation of the elements of the Supper by the *Epiklesis* (I. 274), the sacrifice of animals at the celebration of the dead (I. 269).

² The **Maronites** (p. 10) on the Lebanon had already attached themselves to Latin Christianity in 1182, in consequence of the Crusades, while reserving their ancient customs.

INDEX.

- Abbo of Fleury, 190, 203.
 Abbot-bishops, 99.
 Abel of Rheims, 79, 82.
 Abelard, 342, 374.
 Abraham Ibn Daud, 423.
 Absolution, 339 sqq.
 Acceptance, Frankfurt Charter of, 518.
 Achrida, 85.
 Adalbero of Rheims, 179.
 Adalbert of Augsburg, 175; of Bremen, 254, 362; of Ivrea, 178; of Mayence, 299; of Magdeburg, 148, 153; of Prague, 147, 149; of Tuscany, 173; the Frank, 89.
 Adalhard of Corbie, 197.
 Adalwald, 84.
 Adam, Cistercian Abbot, 334.
 Adamnan, Abbot, 53.
 Adelheid, wife of Otto I., 177; Langmann, 474.
 Ademar of Puy, 246.
 Adescancaster, Monastery, 74.
 Ado of Vienne, 167, 216.
 Adolphus of Nassau, 249.
 Adoptionist Controversy, 130 sqq.
 Aegidius Albornoz, 449; Colonna, 464, of Viterbo, 531.
 Aeldred, 54.
 Aelfric, 206.
 Aneas Silvius, 518.
 Aetius, 37.
 Agapetus II., 174, 176.
 Agatho, Pope, 10, 86.
 Agilulf, 84.
 Agobard of Lyons, 157, 196, 215, 221.
 Agrestius, 60.
 Agricola, Rudolph, 534.
 Aichar of Vermandois, 63.
 Aidan, 51.
 Agilulf, 217.
 Aisulf, 89.
 Aix-la-Chapelle, Rule of, 103, 317.
 Akindynos, 520.
 Alamanni, 57 sq.
 Alanus ab Insulis, 324, 381 sq.
 Alaric, 33, 39.
 Albanenses, 387.
 Alberic, 174.
 Albert of Stade, 365.
 Albertus Magnus, 323, 330, 428.
 Albert I., 289; the Bear, 362 sq.; of Mayence, 264.
 Albigenses, 387, 399.
 Albinus, 35.
 Albiromi, 551.
 Alcheret, 65.
 Alcuin, 125 sqq., 132.
 Aldgild, 63.
 Aldhelm, 54, 123.
 Alexander II., 193, 254; III., 269 sqq., 336; IV., 279, 285; V., 482; VI., 526; of Alexandria, 486; Halesius, 328, 414, 428; Hegius, 534.
 Alexians, 477.
 Alexius I., 237, 246.
 Alfarabi, 422.
 Alfred the Great, 201.
 Algazel, 422.
 Alger, 370.
 d'Allemand, Card., 516.
 All Souls, 214.
 Almansor, 244.
 Alphonsus of Castille, 285; the Catholic, 44; II., the Chaste, 44; I. of Portugal, 274.
 Altmann of Passau, 318.
 Alvarus Pelagius, 464.
 Amalaricus, 196.
 Amalarius of Trèves, 137.
 Amalric of Bena, 426.
 Amandus, 63.
 Amosites, 550.
 Amphiloehius of Cyzicus, 236.
 Anacletus II., 266.
 Anastasius III., 174; IV., 263; I., Greek Emperor, 38; II., Greek Emperor, 10; Bibliothecarius, 201, 216, 225, 236; Patr. of Const., 15; Sinaita, 23.
 Anathema, 220.
 Andreas of Galiano, 458; the Fool, 232; of Crete, 60; Proles, 539; of Rhodos, 553; VI. of Hungary, 247.
 Andronicus III. Palæol., 519.
 Angelus of Clareno, 420, 457.
 Angilbert, 98.
 Angilram, 160.
 Anna, Saint, 514; Commena, 440.
 Annates, 487.
 Anno of Cologne, 210, 254.
 Ansegis of Sens, 171.
 Anselm of Canterbury, 262, 370 sqq., 442; Havelberg (Ravenna), 319; Laon, 196, 376; of Lucca, 254; Milan, 220; the Peripatetic, 209.
 Ansgar, 137 sqq.
 Antonites, 353.
 Antony of Padua, 337, 406, 412.
 Apostle Brothers, 421.
 Apostolics, 386.
 Appeals, 397.
 Appeal of Sachsenhausen, 447, 459.
 Aquileia, Patriarchate, 85.
 Arabs, 4, sqq.
 Arabian Philosophy, 422.
 Arcadius, 33.
 Archdeacon, 101.
 Archidiaconate, 315.
 Architecture, 211.
 Archpresbyter, 101, 315.
 Arduin of Ivrea, 184.
 Arevurdi, 238.
 Ariald, 253.
 Aribert of Milan, 186.
 Aribio of Mayence, 185.
 Arichis of Beneventum, 90.
 Aripert, 85.
 Arn (Arno) of Salzburg, 91, 98.
 Arno of Reichersberg, 379.
 Arnold of Brescia, 267 sqq., 322; of Cîteaux, 399; Garnier, 492; of Laon, 372.
 Arnulf of Carinthia, 172; of Laon, 180; of Metz, 71; of Orleans, 180.
 Arsenius, Legate, 163; Patr. of Const., 519.
 Artabastus, 15.
 Articles of Clarendon, 272.
 Artold of Rheims, 176.
 Asaph, 45.
 Asger of Lund, 361.
 Assembly of Constant. (861), 223; at Compiègne (833), 159; at Diedenhofen (844), 189; at Toledo (589)
 Ataulf, 33.
 Athanasgild, 40.
 Athanasius, Monophysite, 9.
 Athos, Mt. Monastery of, 232.
 Attila, 33.
 Ato of Milan, 255.
 Audians, 32.
 Audoen, 63.
 Augustine of Canterbury, 49; Lucian, 518; Triumphus, 464.
 Augustinian Canons, 318; Hermits, 410.
 Auranus, 232.
 Auricular Confession, 329.
 Authari, 84.
 Autpert, 137.
 Ave Maria, 333.
 Avempace, 423.
 Averroës, 423.
 Averroism, 423.
 Avicenna, 422.
 Avignon, the Popes in, 445 sqq.
 Avitus, Emperor, 36; of Vienne, [39].
 Baanes, 27.
 Bagnolesians, 387.
 Bagratides, 553.
 Baldwin, Cistercian, 366; of Flanders, 247, 276.
 Bangor, Bishopric of, 48.
 Baptism, 113; Churches, 101.
 Bardas, Cæsar, 223, 233.
 Barlaam, 519.
 Barletta, *vid.* Gabriel.
 Bartolus, 544.
 Basilus I., Macedo, 134, 224 sq., 234; II., 228.
 Beatus of Libania, 131.
 Bede, 55, 123.
 Beghards, 475 sqq.
 Beguines, 475 sqq.
 Bekkos, 413.
 Benedict III., 158 sq., 223; IV., 173; V., 178; VI., 179; VII., 151, 179; VIII., 184, 229; IX., 186, 220; X., 260; XI., 445; XII., 448; XIII., 481; of Aniane, 132, 190; Gaucani, 288; Levita, 162.
 Benedictines, Order of, 190.
 Benedictio, 299.
 Benefices, 105, 297.
 Bennchar, Monastery, 48.
 Benno of Meissen, 321.
 Berengar of Ivrea, 177; of Friuli 172; of Narbonne, 458; of Tours, 368 sqq.

- Bernardone, 404.
 Bernardus Primus, 393.
 Bernard of Chartres, 377; of Clairvaux, 268, 322, 337 sq., 351 sq., 376; of Saisset, 289.
 Bernardino of Siena, 460.
 Berno, Cluniac Abbot, 190; Cist. Bishp. 364.
 Bernward of Hildesheim, 208, 337.
 Berthold of Loccum, 365; of Mayence, 543; of Ratisbon, 344, 412.
 Bessarion, 521, 532.
 Begging Orders, 243, 404 sqq.
 Bible, Translations of the, 513.
 Biel, Gabr., 536.
 Bishops among the Franks, 68, 99 sqq.; Relation to the Pope, 296.
 Bishop, Election of, 307.
 Bishopsrics, Saxon, 97 sq.
 Blemmides, 443.
 Bobbio, Monastery, 58.
 Boccaccio, 532.
 Boemund of Tarentum, 246.
 Boëtius, 35.
 Bogomiles, 240.
 Bogoris (Boris), 116, 221.
 Boleslaw Chrobry, 149; the Pious, 147.
 Bonagratia, 456.
 Bonaventura, 334, 341, 430.
 Boniface VII., 179; VIII., 288 sqq., 344; IX., 181; (Winfred), 74 sqq.
 Boni Pueri, 476; valeti, 476.
 Borgia, Cesar, 427.
 Boso of Provence, 172.
 Brant, Seb., 541.
 Brandenburg, Bishopric, 148.
 Breslau, Bishopric, 150.
 Brothers of the Common Life, 499 sqq., 538; of the Law of Christ, 549; Bohemian, 547.
 Brude, 48.
 Bruneleschi, 534.
 Brun of Cologne, 177, 192, 207.
 Bruno of Carinthia, 181; of Cologne, Carth., 319; of Querfurt, 142; of Toul., 249.
 Bulgarians, 133.
 Bulgaria, 387.
 Bull, *Exult*, 420; *in cœna D.*, 312 sq.; *Unam Sanctam*, 290.
 Bursburg, Bishopric, 77.
 Burkhard of Würzburg, 77.
 Bursae, 425.
 Bursfeld, Union of, 538.
 Cadalo of Parma, 254.
 Cadwalla, 51.
 Caedmon, 54.
 Cæsarius of Arles, 72; of Heisterbach, 329, 333.
 Calixtus II. 264, 351; III., 524; III., Antipope, 271.
 Calixtines, 511, 513.
 Callinice, 26.
 Calliopas, 9.
 Camaldolites, 192.
 Candida Casa, 45.
 Canon Law, 317 sqq.
 Canonical Life, 103, 317 sqq.
 Canonization 336.
 Canossa, 258.
 Capitula Angilrami, 160 sq.; of Charlemagne, 96 sq., 127.
 Capitulare, 103.
 Capitularia of Bened., Levita, 162.
 Cardinals, 251.
 Carlmann, 77, 410.
 Carmelites, 410.
 Carvajal, 530.
 Cathedral chapter, 103.
 Cavalieri Gaudenti, 411.
 Carthusians, 349 sqq.
 Cathari, 386 sqq.
 Catharine of Siena, 450, 480.
 Cedd, 51.
 Celestine I., 46; II., 267, 358; III., 274; IV., 279, 283; V., 287, 288.
 Celestian Hermits, 420.
 Celibacy, 315 sqq.
 Cesena, *vid.* Michael.
 Charles Martel, 65, 72, 77 sqq.
 Charlemagne, 90 sqq., 94 sqq.
 Charles the Bald, 155, 169 sqq.; the Fat, 171; IV., 450; VII., of France, 524; VIII., 526 sq.; of Anjou, 285, 287; of Durazzo, 480.
 Cheitmar, 98.
 Childeric I., 37; III., 71.
 Children, Communion of, 328; Pilgrimage of, 544.
 Chlotar, II., 57.
 Chosrau, I., 3; II., 3.
 Christian of Oliva, 366; of Stavelot, 198.
 Christianizing of the Baltic Provinces, 364.
 Christianities, 101.
 Christine Ebner, 474.
 Chrodegang of Metz, 103.
 Chrysocheres, 237.
 Chrysostom, 32.
 Church, Irish, 303; Milanese, 304.
 Churches, Patriarchal, 20.
 Church property, 105; discipline, 114 sqq.
 Cid, 245.
 Cilian, 62.
 Cistercians, 350 sqq.
 City bishops, 97.
 Clara Scifi, 407.
 Clarisses, 407.
 Claudius of Turin, 196 sq., 215.
 Clement II., 187, 249; III., 274; IV., 279, 285; V., 329, 445, 456, 477; VI., 449; VII., 480; III., Antipope, 259; Moravian Bishop, 146; the Scot, 80.
 Clementines, 293.
 Clergy, Exemption of the, 306; internal relations, 314 sqq.; Immunity of the, 306; Social relations, 305; Rank of the, 104; Secularization of the, 487; Election of, 102 sqq.; Condition in Greek Church, 22 sqq.
 Clothilde, 37.
 Clovis, 37, 67.
 Clugny, 190.
 Cluniacs, 346.
 Cnut the Great, 141; Law, 361.
 Codex Templensis, 543.
 Cola di Rienzi, 449.
 Collegiate foundations, 104.
 Colloquies (in Bohemia), 550.
 Colman, 52.
 Colonna, Card., 507.
 Columba (Columbanus), 48, 56, 70, 123.
 Comgall, 56.
 Commendatory Abbots, 109.
 Community (Franciscan), 416.
 Compacts of Igiau, 513; of Prague, 513.
 Conception, the Immaculate, 333.
 Concordats (after 1417), 485 sqq.; of Aschaffenburg (Vienna), 518; the French, 530; of Sutri (1111), 263; of Worms, 265.
 Concorrezans, 387.
 Confession, 112, 337.
 Conrad I., 175; II., 185, 267; Celtes, 535; of Marburg, 401; of Meigenburg, 464; of Walldhausen, 498.
 Conradin, 285.
 Consolamentum, 387, 388.
 Constant II., 9.
 Constantine I., (Pope), 43; IV., Paganatus, 10, 87; V. Copron., 15; VI., Porphyrog., 16; VII., Porphyrog., 234 sqq.; IX., Monom., 229; Chrysomalus, 242; (Cyril), 143 sqq.; of Cæsarea, 553; the Paulician, 26.
 Constance of Sicil., 274 sqq.
 Constitutio Leonis VIII., 178; Romana, 156; of Frederick II., 280, 309, 312 sqq.
 Constitutum Constant., 93.
 Conversi, 348, 353.
 Corbinian, 61.
 Corpus Christi, Feast of, 329.
 Corvey, founded, 197.
 Cosmas of Jerus., 14, 19; of Majuma, 20.
 Cosmo de Medici, 533.
 Councils, Right of, 295, *vid.* also Synods; of Bâle (1431-48), 514; of Constantinople (VI., Ecumenical, 680), 10 sqq.; 87; of Constantinople (869), 223; Germanicum I. (742), 77; of Kostnitz, 482 sqq.; Lateran I. (1123), 265; II., (1139), 267, 305, 316; III., (1179), 274, 310, 316; IV. (1215), 278, 307, 310, 329, 332, 340.
 Council of Lyons (1245), 283; (1274), 286, 309; of Niceæ II. (787), 16, 128; of Pisa (1409), 482; (1511), 529; Quinisextum (692), 87.
 Council, National (1510), 528.
 Council, II. Trullan (692), 11 sqq.; of Vienne (1311), 454, 487.
 Courtenay, 492, 495.
 Cracow, bishop., 150.
 Crescentius, 179, 181 sq.; Jesi, 416.
 Crucifers, 353 sqq.
 Crucifix, 20.
 Crusade, 245 sqq.; Fred. II., 281; VI. (Lewis), 285; Children's 247.
 Cudbert, 52.
 Cujavia Bishopric.
 Cultius, 19 sqq.; preaching, 119.
 Cunibert of Turin, 253; of Cologne.
 Cunincbert, 87.
 Cup, Withholding of, 328.
 Curati, 100.
 Curia, Papal, 298.
 Cyril, 143, sqq.
 Cyrillian Script, 144.
 Cyrus of Phasis, 8.
 Dagobert, 62.
 Dambert of Pisa, 246.
 Damasus II., 188.
 Damian, *vid.* Petrus.
 Damianites, 407.
 Daniel of Bangor, 46; of Winchester, 74.
 Dankbrand, 141.
 Dante, 461, 532.
 David of Augsburg, 436; of Dinant, 426; of Ireland, 303; of Menevia, 46.
 Dead, Leagues of the, 114.
 Deans, 101.
 Decretales Extravagantes, 293; Pseudoisidor., 160 sqq.

- Decretum Gratiani, 292.
 Delegatus, 298.
 Desiderius, Lombard, 90;
 Erasmus, 538, 541; of Monte
 Casino, 251, 261.
 Deus dedit, 292.
 Devolution, Right of, 297.
 Diego of Osma, 399.
 Diet at Carisiacum (754), 89; at
 Paderborn (777), 95; (785);
 95; Soissons (751), 89.
 Dietrich of Thorida, 365.
 Diether of Mayence, 525.
 Dionysius Bar Salibi, 552; of
 Telmahar, 552.
 Diploma of Otto III., 183.
 Discipline, Ecclesiastical, 103.
 Dispensation, Right of, 295.
 Dolcino, Fra, 421.
 Donato Constantini, 92 sqq.;
 Pippini, 89.
 Dominic, 337, 408.
 Dominicans, 408 sqq.
 Dominicus Gonzalvi, 423.
 Dorotheus, 60.
 Dormi secure, 541.
 Dorso, 401.
 Drogo of Metz, 138, 157.
 Dschem, 526.
 Dues, Ecclesiastical, 299.
 Dungal, 196.
 Duns Scotus, *vid.* Johannes.
 Dunstan, 191, 206.
 Durandus of Huesca, 393; of St.
 Purcain, 465.
 Eadbad, 50.
 Eadwin, 50.
 Eanfried, 51.
 Earnest of Pardubitz, 497.
 Eberhard II. of Salzburg, 283.
 Ebo of Rheims, 137, 155, 165.
 Ebroin, 71.
 Ecbert, 386; of Trèves, 207.
 Eckart, Mstr., 468 sq.
 Edification, Literature of, 541.
 Edmund of England, 285.
 Edward I., 289 sq.; III., 490.
 Egbert, 53, 64.
 Egila, 130.
 Egil, 194.
 Ekkehard of St. Gall, 208.
 Ekthesis, Imperial, 9.
 Election, Capitulations of, 314.
 of the Pope, 251.
 Elias of Cortona, 406.
 Eligius, 63.
 Ehipandus, 130.
 Elizabeth, Saint, 337, 437; of
 Schönaun, 332, 417.
 Elise Stagel, 471.
 Emmeran, 60.
 Engelbert of Admont, 461.
 Enthusiasts, 239.
 Enzo, 282.
 ἐπισκοπος οἰκουμενικός, 85.
 Erasmus, *vid.* Desiderius.
 Erchempert, 216.
 Fremwulf, 76.
 Erfurt, Bishopric, 76.
 Frimbort, 76.
 Erlimbald, 195, 255, 257.
 Ethelbert of Kent, 49.
 Etherius of Othma, 131.
 Euthices, 239 sq.
 Eudo de Stella, 384.
 Eugenius II., 156; III., 243, 267
 sq.; IV., 514.
 Eulogius of Alexandria, 83.
 Euric, 33, 36.
 Eusebius Bruno, 369.
 Eustasius, 60.
 Eustathius of Nicæa, 237; of
 Thessalonica, 441.
 Eustratius of Nicæa, 440. (440.
 Euthymius, 228; Zygadenus,
 Evervin, 386.
 Ewalds, The two, 94.
 Excommunication, 220, 311.
 Fasti, Sermons on, 541.
 Fastidius, 45.
 Felix V., 517; the priest, 51; of
 Urgel, 131.
 Ferdinand, the Catholic, 546;
 I., of Castile, 244.
 Fidelis, 131.
 Finan, 51.
 Finnian, 48.
 Flagellants, 419, 541.
 Flooard, 208.
 Florentius of Acre (Arles), 418;
 Radewins, 509.
 Florus Diaconus, 198, 204; of
 Lyons, 160.
 Folmar of Triefenstein, 380.
 Formosus, Pope, 172; Bishop of
 Bulg., 225.
 Fortunatus of Grado, 87.
 Franks, 36 sqq.
 Frankish Church, 67 sqq.
 Franciscans, 404 sqq.; Conflicts
 among, 455.
 Francis, Saint, 337.
 Franciscus Mayron, 465.
 Francis I. of France, 530.
 Fraticelli, 457.
Frates cellitac, 477; *conversi*,
 348, 353; *minores*, 405;
prædicatores, 409.
 Fredegar, 71.
 Fredregis of Tours, 196.
 Frederick I., 246, 268 sqq.; II.,
 247; of Swabia, 247, 359;
 Bishop, 141; of Magdeburg,
 544; of Mayence, 177; of
 Monte Casino, 250; Rayser,
 518.
 Fridolin, 59.
 Friela, 44.
 Fulbert of Chartres, 209.
 Fulda, 82.
 Fuldrat, 83.
 Fulke of Neuilly, 247, 276, 322;
 of Toulouse, 408; of Rheims,
 208.
 Gabriel of Barletta, 541; Biel,
 536.
 Gainas, 32.
 Gaiseric, 34.
 Gajeziks, 238.
 Gallus, 58.
 Garcias, 244.
 Gaston, 353.
 Gaubald, 76.
 Gauzbert, 139.
 Gayar Moulin, 542.
 Gebhard of Eichstädt, 250.
 Gedimin of Lithuania, 521.
 Geller of Keisersbg., 541, 545.
 Gelasius III., 264.
 Gemistus Pletho, 532.
 Genesis, 27.
 Gennadius, 532.
 Gentile, Franciscan, 459.
 George Podiebrad, 514, 525.
 George, Presbyter, 60.
 Gerardus of Borgo S. Donnino,
 418.
 Gerberga, 207.
 Gerbert, 179 sqq., 208.
 Gerard of Florence, 250; Groot,
 500; Segarelli, 421; Zerboid,
 501.
 Gerhoh of Reichersberg, 295,
 307, 318 sq., 379.
 Gerlach Pieters, 501.
 Germanus of Auxerre, 45; Paib.
 of Const., 14.
 Gerson, 441, 502, 504, 542.
 Gertrude, 437; of Hackeborn,
 437.
 Gervasius of Const., 278.
 Gewilip of Mayence, 78, 79.
 Gevsa, 151.
 Gilbert of London, 273 sq.;
 Porretanus, 376.
 Gildas, 115.
 Giotto, 534.
 Giovanni Angelico da Fiesole,
 534.
 Giseler of Slatheim, 471.
 Gislemar, 138.
 Glagolitic script, 144.
 Gnesen, Archbpr., 150.
 Godehard of Hildesheim, 211.
 God, the Friends of, 472 sqq.
 Godfrey of Admont, 324; of
 Bouillon, 246; of Lekno,
 366; of Milan, 255; of
 Vendôme, 326, 331.
 Gorm the Old, 140.
 Goths, 30 sqq.
 Gottschalk, 149, 203 sqq.
 Grado, 85.
 Gran, Archbpr., 152.
Gratiæ expectatvæ, 487.
 Gratian, 292.
 Gregory I., 73, 84, 122; II., 14,
 61, 74, 88; III., 14, 61, 88;
 IV., 138, 157 sq., 215; V.,
 181; VI., 186, 343; VII.,
 245, 255 sqq., 301, 343; VIII.,
 246, 274; IX., 280 sqq.; X.,
 286, 000, 443; XI., 450, 478,
 492; XII., 482; VIII., Anri-
 Pope, 264; Abulfaradj, 552;
 Asbesta, 223; the Bohemian,
 549; of Utrecht, 65; of
 Heimbürg, 525; Magister,
 239; Palamas, 520; of Tours,
 69, 71.
 Gregorians, 501.
 Greek Church, Separation of,
 230.
 Grimo of Rouen, 79, 82.
 Grimoald, 85; of S. Gall, 207.
 Gritsch, J., 541.
 Günther of Cologne, 139, 167.
 Guibert of Nogent, 323 sq., 332,
 373.
 Guido of Montpellier, 353; of
 Vienne, 264.
 Guillelmi, 541.
 Gundobald, 39 sq.
 Gunthram of Burgundy, 57.
 Gylas, 151.
 Hadrian I., 53, 90, 131, 216; II.,
 144, 164, 169 sq., 225; IV.,
 269 sq.; V., 286; the Anglo-
 Saxon, 123.
 Haimo of Halberstadt, 195.
 Haimo of Armenia, 195.
 Hakem, 244.
 Hans, the one-eyed, 401.
 Harold, Blaatand, 140; Har-
 fagr, 141.
 Hartbert of Sens, 79.
 Hartwich of Bremen, 362.
 Hatto of Mayence, 173 sq.; of
 Vich, 179.
 Havelberg, Bishopric, 148.
 Huyomo of Feversham, 416.
 Hebdomadarii, 251.
 Hedenus, 62.
 Henry I., 171; II., 183, 337;
 III., 186 sqq.; IV., 254 sqq.;
 V., 363 sqq.; VI., 275; VII.,
 447; II. of England, 272;
 of Ceca, 457; of Clairvaux,
 399; Cluniac, 385 sq.; of
 Cologne, 477; Deacon, 322;
 of Gent, 431; of Halle, 437;
 Institoris, 545; of Langen-
 stein, 505; of Nordlingen,

- 474; Raspe, 284; Saso, 470 sq.; of Trèves, 177; of Virneburg, 448.
 Heland, the, 211.
 Helpers in need, 337.
 Heloise, 374.
 Hendrik Munde, 501.
 Heraclius, 3, 8.
 Heridag, 137.
 Heriger of Mayence, 176.
 Hermann Balk, 367; of Reichenau, 208; of Salza, 359.
 Hermenegild, 40.
 Herolt, J., 541.
 Herrad of Landsberg, 542.
 Hervæus Natalis, 464.
 Heschem III., 244.
 Hesychnasts, 519.
 Heynlin of Stein, 534.
 Hicetae, 442.
 Hieronymians, 501. [541].
 Hieronymus of Düngersheim, Hilarion, 154.
 Hildebert of Lavardin, 376.
 Hildebrand, 249 sqq.
 Hildegard, St., 417.
 Hildegim, 97.
 Hildibald of Cologne, 91.
 Hilduin, 198.
 Hincmar of Laon, 170; of Rheims, 162, 165, 198, 204 sq., 221.
 Hispana, Collection of Canons, 160.
 History-Bibles, 542.
 Honorius II., 266; III., 279, 329; IV., 286; II. Antipope, 254; Emperor, 33; of Autun, 324, 338, 373.
 Hospitalers, Brothers, 353.
 Hospitaliers of the Holy Spirit, 353.
 Hrabanus Maurus, 182 sqq., 210, 216.
 Huebald, 208, 213.
 Huebert of S. Maurice, 167.
 Hugh Capet, 179; of Farva, 184; of Fleury, 265; de Peraudo, 450; of Provence, 174; de Payns, 356; of S. Victor, 318, 326, 338, 377; the White, 257.
 Hulagu, 551.
 Humanism, 531 sqq.
 Humanists, German, 534.
 Humbert, Cardinal, 230, 369; de Romanis, 286.
 Humiliates, 392 sq.
 Hunneric, 34.
 Hus, *vid.* John.
 Hussites, 510.
 Hyacinth, 367.
 Hymns, composition of, 213.
 Ignatius of Const., 222 sq.
 Imbert, 452.
 Indulgences, 220.
 Infallibility, papal, 206.
 Ingundis, 40.
 Innocent II., 266; III., 243 sq., 247, 275 sqq., 302, 327, 329, 343; IV., 279, 283 sqq., 302; V., 286; VI., 449; VII., 481; VIII., 526.
 Inquisition, 401 sqq.; in Spain, 546.
 Interdict, 221, 311.
 Investiture, law of, 257, 259; controversy, 261 sqq.
 Iolanthe, 250.
 Irene, 16.
 Irinus, 51.
 Isaac Commenus, 246.
 Isabella, 546.
 Isidore of Kieff, 521; of Seville, 43, 123.
 Isleif Gizurason, 141.
 Isleip of Canterbury, 491.
 Iso, 207.
 Ivo of Chartres, 262, 265, 292, 299, 318.
 Jacopo de Benedetti, 412.
 Jacobus, Arm. bishop, 238; of Aquila, 539; Baradaeus, 552; Faber Stapulensis, 536; of Jüterbogk, 537; Magister, 499; of Maerlant, 542; of the Mark, 460; of Mies, 508.
 Jacques de Molay, 452.
 Jacobus von Sirk, 517; Sprenger, 545.
 Jacobites, 552.
 Jagello, 521.
 Jazid II., 14.
 Joachim of Corace, 417 sq.
 Joachimism, 416 sq.
 Joan, popess, 159.
 Joannes de Roncho, 394.
 Joannisa, 443.
 John Brescain, 432; Brinkerink, 501; Buridan, 467; of Busch, 538; of Dalberg, 534; of England, 244, 278; Dederoth of Hazen, 530; of Goch, 536; Hus, 506 sq.; of Margnala, 552; Mouston, 503; Petrus Olivi, *vid.* Petrus; of Piano-Carpini, 551; Picus of Mirandola, 538; Reuchlin, 535; Ruysbroek, 471 sq.; of Staupitz, 539; Tanler, 469 sq.; of Valle, 459; Veghe, 541; of Veletri, 250; of Werden, 541 of Wesel, 536; Wessel, 537; Wiclif, 490 sqq.
 Johannes I., 35; VI., 87; VIII., 145, 164, 170 sq., 226; IX., 173, 228; X., 174; XI., 174, 231; XII., 174, 177; XIII., 178; XIV., 179; XV., 179; XVI., XVII., 184; XVIII., 184 sq.; XIX., 185, 229; XXI., 286; XXII., 447, 450 sq., 477; XXIII., 482; Antiochenus, 442; Bulgarian Prince, 277; Capistrano, 460, 540 sq.; Climacus, 22; of Damascus, 14, 19, 23; Duns Scotus, 434, 465; of Falckenberg, 485; of Ficubna, 157; Fidanza, 430; Gratianus, 186; Gualbert, 192; Hyspalensis, 423; of Janduno, 462; Jejunator, 86; Kerni, 553; de Monte Corvino, 552; Moschus, 22; de Murro, 420; Nestestes, 442; Parens, 414; of Paris, 372, 461, 464; of Parma, 416; Philosophus, 238; Priests' King, 551; of Ravenna, 165; of Salisbury, 380; of Salzburg, 76; Scotus Origena, 198 sqq., 204; of Thrani, 229; Tzimisces, 233, 237; Xiphilinus, 440; Zonaras, 440.
 Johannes, 354 sq.
 John Colet, 536; Oldecastle, 497.
 Jonas of Orleans, 197.
 Jordan of Osnabrück, 461.
 Joseph, Patr. of Const., 443.
 Jubilee Indulgence, 344.
 Julius II., 528; Cesarini, 486, 522.
 Jurisdiction, spiritual, 315.
Jus prim. precum, 309.
 Justinian I., 35; II., 11, 87.
 Justus of Rochester, 50.
 Jutta of Sangershausen, 436.
 Kamel of Egypt, 247.
 Karbeas, 29.
 Karraric, 39.
 Kentigern of Glasgow, 46.
 Kieff, 153; Cave Monastery, 153.
 Knights Brothers of Dobrin, 367.
 Knightly Orders, 354.
 Kolberg, bishop, 150.
 Kozel, 134.
 Kubilai, 551.
 Kyllene, 62.
 Lambert le Begue, 475.
 Lamprecht of Rausbon, 438.
 Lando, 174.
 Landulf, 263.
 Lanfranc, 260, 339, 368 sqq.
 Lantbert, 171.
 Laurentius of Canterbury, 50; Valla, 538.
 Lay-brethren, 349, 353.
 Lay investiture, 262.
 Lay cup, 508.
 League of Cambray, 528.
 Leander of Seville, 40, 42, 86.
 Lebuin, 65, 96.
 Legates, 298.
 Legend of the 11,000 Virgins, 332, 417.
 Leidrad of Lyons, 132, 196.
 Leo III., 91, 132; IV., 156, 157, 223; VI., 174; VIII., 178; IX., 229 sq., 249; X., 530; XII., Isaauricus, 14; IV., Chazarus, 16; V., The Armenian, 16; VI., the Philosopher, 227 sqq.; of Achrida, 229; Stytiota, 242; of Thessalonica, 233.
 Leodegar of Autun, 71.
 Leuthard, 382.
 Leuvigild, 40.
 Lewis the German, 155; the Child, 173; the Bavarian, 446; VII. of France, 246, 267; IX., 244, 247, 284 sq.; XI., 525; XII., 527, 530.
 Liberatus, 420.
 Libri Carolini, 127.
 Liemar, 361.
 Lioba, 83, 110.
 Lionardo da Vinci, 534.
 Liturgy, Mozarabic, 43; Roman, 112.
 Lindger, 65, 97.
 Liutprand of Cremona, 206; King of the Langob., 75, 88.
 Livinus, 63.
 Lollhards, 477.
 Lombard cities, League of, 271.
 Lombardy, Poor men of, 394.
 Longland, 491.
 Lothar I., 156; II., 167 sqq.; of Saxony, 266.
 Low masses, 113.
 Lucas of Prague, 550.
 Lucius II., 267; III., 274, 323, 400.
 Ludmilla, 147.
 Lullus, 53.
 Lupold of Bebenburg, 461.
 Luxeuil Monastery, 70.
 Magdeburg, Archbpre., 148.
 Magnald, 58.
 Magna Charta, 278.
 Majolus of Clugny, 191.
 Major domus, 71.
 Malachias of Armagh, 303.
 Manasse I. of Rheims, 349.
 Manfred, 285.

- Mangu, 551.
 Manichees, 26.
 Mansur, 15.
 Mantua, Congress of Princes at, 524.
 Manuel of Adrianople, 146.
 Maphrian, 552.
 Marcus, heretical bishop, 387.
 Marco Polo, 552.
 Marculf, Book of formulæ, 71.
 Marcus Eugenius, 521.
 Margarethe Ebner, 471.
 Mariolatry, 333.
 Marinus I., 227; II., 172.
 Maron, Monastery of, 10.
 Maronites, 10, 653.
 Marozia, 173.
 Marriage, 118; hindrances to, 119.
 Marsilius Ficinus, 523; of Padua, 462.
 Martin I., 9, 63, 86; IV., 287, 288; V., 484; Bishop of Dumio, 39; Meyer, 524.
 Martinian, 60.
 Martyrologies, 216.
 Masachio, 534.
 Mass, The, 113, 214, 326, 330.
 Matilda of Tuscany, 258.
 Matteo Visconti, 447.
 Matthias of Cracow, 505; of Jarow, 499; of Kunwald, 550; of Hungary (Corvinus), 525.
 Mauritianus, 86.
 Maurus of Amalfi, 000.
 Maximilian I., 527.
 Maximus Confessor, 22.
 Mechthild of Magdeburg, 437; of Hackeborn, 437.
 Meerssen, Treaty of, 156.
 Meinhard of Segeberg, 365.
 Mellinus, 50.
 Mendoza, 546.
 Merseburg, bishopric, 148.
 Methodius of Syracuse, 236; (Apostle of the Slavs), 143 sqq.
 Metropolitanans, 102.
 Michael I., *Rhangabe*, 28; II., *Babus*, 17; *Palacol*, 283, 443, 519; *Pselius*, 235, 439; *Cæularius*, 229 sq.; *Cezena*, 458; of Seutenberg, 5.
 Michael Angelo, 534.
 Migetius, 130.
 Milicz, 498.
 Militia beatæ Mariæ virg., 411; Christi, 411.
 Milo of Trèves, 72.
 Missions in Bohemia, 147; in Bulgaria, 146; among the Chazars, 152; in Greece, 143; in Poland, 149; in Prussia, 149; among the Russians, 152; in Hungary, 149; among the Wends, 148 sq.
 Missionary preaching, 119.
 Moengal, 207.
 Mohammed, 4 sqq.
 Moimir, 142. [69.
 Monastic life among the Franks, 232, 441.
 Monasteries, 20, 189 sqq.; royal, 109, 193; patriarchal, 21.
 Monastic property, 105; system, 109.
 Monothelite Controversy, 8 sqq.
 Moses Maimonides, 423.
 Muntone, 411.
 Murbach, Monastery, 59.
 Musa, 43.
 Music, 213.
 Muspilli, 211.
 Mutazilites, 422.
 Mysticism, German, 468.
 Naithan, 53.
 Narses, 41.
 Nefried of Narbonne, 132.
 Nerves of Lampron, 553; of Urmia, 553.
 Nestor, 154.
 Nestorians, 551.
 Nicephorus, Emperor, 28; Patr. of Const., 16; II., Phocas, 232; Gregoras, 520.
 Nicetas Acominatus, 440; Antipope, 387; Pectoratus, 230; Seronius, 440.
 Nicholas I., 164 sq., 205, 223; II., 250; III., 286 sqq.; IV., 286, 553; V., 622; V., Antipope, 447; of Bâle, 473; Cabasilas, 520; the Cistercian, 334; of Clemanges, 481 sq., 504; Patr. of Const., 227; Cusanus, 515, 525, 536, 538; of Herford, 495; of Methone, 440; Pisanus, 534; of Riga, 366; of Strassburg, 471; of Tusculum, 278.
 Niklot, 362.
 Nilon, 232.
 Nikus, 182, 192.
 Ninian, 45, 47.
 Niphon, 519.
 Nominalism, 372.
 Norbert, 318 sq.; Canon, 322.
 Notker Balbulus, 207, 213, 216; Labeo, 208; of Liege, 208.
 Nunneries, 110.
 Oaths, 118; of the Metropolitanans, 296.
 Oblatio, 299.
 Observants, 460; Augustinian, 539; Franciscan, 540.
 Occam, 458, 463, 466.
 Octavian, 174.
 Odilo, Duke of Bavaria, 76; of Clugny, 184.
 Odo of Paris, 328.
 Odoacer, 34.
 Œcumenism, 235.
 Offa of Mercia, 54.
 Officials, Episcopal, 315.
Officium cardinale, 251.
 Oktai, 551.
 Olaf the Fat, 141; Trygvason, 140.
 Olga, 153.
 Olgerd of Lithuania, 521.
 Olivi, *vid.* Petrus.
 Olympius, 9.
 Ordeals, 118, 221.
 Order of Calatrava, 359; Evora, 359; Fontévrard, 349; Grammont, 348; S. Jago di Compostella, 360; S. Juliàni de Pereyro (of Alcantara), 359; of Vallombrosa, 192.
 Organs, 112.
 Orphans, 511.
 Orphanites, 511.
 Oswy, 61.
 Otfried of Weisssemburg, 211.
 Otgar of Mayence, 162 sq.
 Otto I., 176 sq., 262; II., 179; III., 179 sqq.; IV., 275; of Bamberg, 321, 337, 363.
 Otric, 207.
 Otwin of Hildesheim, 216.
 Palec, 507.
 Palladius, 46.
 Paltz, A., 545.
 Pandulf, 278.
 Panegyricus Berengarii, 206.
 Paolo de Trinci, 460.
 Papacy, 300.
 Papal election, 287; right, 294 sqq.
 Paracondaces, 28.
 Parliament of Paris, 489.
 Parochia, 100.
 Parish churches, 100; clergy, 100.
 Paschal I., 156; II., 262; III., Anti-pope, 271.
 Paschasius Radbertus, 197, 201 sqq.
 Pataria (Patarini), 253, 261.
 Patarini, 389.
 Patriciate, 187.
 Patrick, Saint, 46 sq., 115.
Patronium S. Petri, 85.
 Patronage, Right of, 307 sq.
 Patto, 97.
 Paul I., 90, 127; II., 525.
 Paulicians, 26 sqq., 237.
 Paulinus of Aquileia, 87, 131; of York, 50.
 Paulus Diaconus, 124; Monophysite, 8; the Paulician, 26.
 Pauperes Catholici, 393; Lombardici, 393; de Lugduno, 391 sqq.
 Pelagius II., 85.
 Pelayo of Asturia, 44.
 Penance, Columba's Book of, 71; discipline of, 114 sq., 217 sq.; redemptions of, 117, 217; periods of, 219.
 Penda, 51.
 Penny preachers, 344.
 Peter d'Ailly, 503 sq.; of Amiens, 246; of Aragon, 277, 287; of Bruns, 322, 385; of Chelcizky, 549.
 Piero de' Medici, 527. [379.
 Peter Payne, 512; of Poitiers, Peter's penny, 54, 299.
 Petarch, 532.
 Petrobrusians, 385.
 Petrus Cantor, 322; Comestor, 316, 542; Damiani, 186, 192 sq., 253, 301, 334, 338; Joannis Olivi, 420; Lombardus, 330, 331, 339, 378; de Luna, 481; de Murone, 288, 420; of Ortona, 175; Paludanus, 459; Siculus, 237; Venerabilis, 333, 347, 352; de Vineis, 282.
 Philip of Swabia, 275; II. Aug. of France, 247, 262 sq., 277; IV., le Bel, 244, 288, 451 sqq.; de Novavilla, 549; of Majorca, 459; the Monk, 366.
 Philippicus Bardanes, 10, 87.
 Philostorgius, 32.
 Phocas, 3, 86.
 Photius, 146, 223 sqq., 235.
 Phundaites, 240.
 Pierre Dubois, 461; of Castelnau, 399.
 Pilgrim of Passan, 151.
 Piphili (Piphles), 387.
 Pippin of Herstal, 72; the Short, 77, 79, 89.
 Pirmin, 59.
 Plus II., 524; III., 528.
 Plato, Abbot, 24.
 Plebani, 101.
 Plebes, 101.
 Plenary indulgence, 220.
 Plenaries, 542.
 Penitential, 116.
 Penitentiarii, 315.
 Poggio, 532.
 Pontius of Clugny, 347; of Perigneux, 366.

- Popelikan, 387.
 Poppo of Brixen, 188.
 Posen, bishopric, 149.
 Poverty, Controversy on, in
 Franciscan Order.
Præceptum Childeberti, 67.
Pragites, 511.
Pragmatic Sanction of 1269, 304
 sq.; of Bourges, 516.
Preaching, 119 sq., 321 sqq., 510
 sq.
Precaria, 78.
Predestination, double, 201.
Premonstratensians, 318 sq.
Priests, Marriage of, 12, 253; in
 England, 260.
Priests, Chant of, 213.
Private penance, 116; mass, 114.
Privilegium of Henry II., 185;
 of Otto I., 177.
Procopius, the elder, 511.
Property, Churches' right of,
 308.
Provisions, Papal, 486.
Prudentius, 198, 201.
Publicans, 386.
Pullans, 246.
Purvey, 495, 496.
Pyrrhus, Patr. of Const., 9.

Quinisextum, 11.

Rabban Ara, 551.
Radbertus Paschasius, 197, 203
 sq.
Radbod, 63 sq.
Radegundis, 61.
Raginfrid of Cologne, 77.
Rainald of Dassel, 270.
Raphael, 534.
Ratislav of Moravia, 143.
Ratherius, 206.
Ratramnus, 198, 204, 206.
Raymond of Toulouse, 246, 399.
Raymundus Gaufridi, 419, 455;
 Lullus, 433 sq.; de Penna-
 forte, 293, 342; de Puis,
 355; of Sabunde, 536.
Realism, 372 sq.
Reccared, 40 sqq.
Redwald, 50.
Reginfrid, 82.
Regino of Prüm, 218.
Regional bishops, 99.
Regular Canons, 320.
Reichenau, monastery, 59.
Relics, 20, 113, 545; worship of,
 214; veneration of, 331 sq.
Remigius, Saint, 37; of Lyons,
 167, 204.
Remismund, 34.
Rense, Electoral association at,
 448.
Reservations, Papal, 299, 486;
 ecclesiastical, 313.
Reuchlin, 535.
Rhodoad of Porto, 167.
Richard Cœur de Lion, 247, 275;
 of Cornwall, 285; Abbot,
 332; of Armagh, 491; of S.
 Victor, 341, 378.
Richbald, Archpriest, 145.
Rimbart, 140.
Rinsing cup, 328.
Robert of Arbrissel, 322, 349; of
 Citeaux, 350;
Robert Capito, 423, 429; de Cour-
 con, 425; of Flammeshur, 342;
 of Flanders, 262; of
 Francia, 182; Grosseteste,
 305; Guiscard, 246, 257; of
 Normandy, 246; of Paris,
 372; Pulleyn, 327, 378; of
 Sorbonne, 425.
Roderick, 43.
Rodrigo Diaz, 245.

Roger Bacon, 431; of Beziers,
 399; of York, 273.
Rokyana, 511.
Roland of Siena, 270.
Romanus Lecapenus, 230.
Romuald, 191, 215.
Rosary, 335.
Roscelin, 372.
Roswitha, 207.
Rothad of Soissons, 166.
Royalties, 270; Church's right
 to, 309.
Rubenites, 552.
Rudolph of Habsburg, 287; of
 Swabia, 259.
Rulman Merswin, 473 sq.
Rupert of Deutz, 327, 334, 370;
 of Worms, 60.
Ruric, 152.

Saadja, 423.
Sacraments, 326 sqq.
Saints, the 113; lives of, 216;
 worship of, 214; Greek
 legends of, 236; Veneration
 of, 331 sqq.
Saladin, 246.
Sancho I., 277; III., 244.
Sanctia of Naples, 458.
Savonarola, 527.
Saxons, conversion of the, 94 sqq.
Sbynko of Prague, 506.
Schism, the Great, 479 sqq.
Scourging, penance by, 419.
Secular Canons, 320.
Scolius Erigena, *vid.* Johannes.
Sedulius Scotus, 196.
Seligenstadt, Resolutions of,
 185.
Sembat, 237.
Senate, episcopal, 314.
Sequences, 213 sq.
Sergius I., 12, 87; II., 156; III.,
 173 sq., IV., 184, 228;
 Armenian Catholics, 239;
 Patr. of Const., 8, 228;
 Paulician, 27.
Sertak, 551.
Servatus Lupus, 197.
Servites, 410.
Servitia communia, 487.
Severians, 9.
Severinus, 60.
S. Germano, Peace of, 282.
Siegfried of Mayence, 245, 284.
Sigebert, 51.
Sigismund, Emperor, 508;
 Duke of Austria, 525.
Sigmund of Burgundy, 39.
Sigurd, 142.
Simon, Langham, 491; de
 Montfort, 399; de Tournay,
 422.
Simony, 248; in the Frankish
 Church, 71.
Sisebut, 43.
Sisterhouses of the Common
 Life, 538.
Sixtus, IV., 526; V. 251.
Slavs, 4; Christianizing of the;
 361.
Soliman I., 14.
Solomon of Constance, 175, 207.
Solomon ben Gebirol, 423.
Sopronius, 9, 22.
Soterichos Panteugenos, 410.
Soul masses, 113, 214.
Spencer, Bishop, 496.
Spirituals, 419.
Spotii, ius, 309, 484.
Suafism, 7.
Stanislaus of Znaim, 506.
stedingians, Crusade against,
 402.
Steffnir, Thorgrilsson, 141.
Sun, Children of the, 238.

Stephen II., 15, 89; III., 90,
 251; IV., 156; V., 146, 172;
 VI., 173, 227; VIII., 174;
 IX., 250; Abbot, 343;
 Bishop of the Waldenses,
 550; of Blois, 272; Patr.
 of Const., 227; Langton, 277,
 322; Tempier, 432; of
 Tigerno, 348; of Tournay,
 293; of Hungary, 151.
Sturmi, 76, 82.
Scylian, 227.
Suffragan bishops, 103.
Suidbert, 64, 94.
Suidger of Bamberg, 187.
Sunnites, 6.
Surgant, Uir. 541.
Swen Fork-beard, 140.
Swatopluck, 144, 145.
Sword, Order of the, 359, 361.
Sylvanus, 27.
Sylvester II., 150, 182, 245; III.,
 186.
Synods, *vid.* also Councils.
Synod, General (869), 169; of
 Aix-la-Chapelle (130, 153,
 167, 181); of Anse (1025),
 193; of Attigny (762), 114;
 of Attigny (870), 170; Arles
 (1265), 418; Augsburg
 (1062), 254; Bâle (11th
 century), 254; Bracara,
 (561), 39, 328; Bremen (1230)
 402; Cahel (1171), 304;
 Chalons (813), 117, 219;
 (1107), 263; Chester (1157),
 262; Clermont, (1095), 246,
 261; Cloveshove (747), 64,
 118; Compiègne (1193), 277;
 Constantinople (588), 85;
 (754), 15; (842), 17; (880),
 226; (1143), 242; (1156), 440;
 (1348), 51, 520; Doney (870),
 170; Epaoon, (517), 39;
 Frankish (745), 79 sqq.;
 Frankfort (794), 128;
 Frankfort (798), 108, 114;
 Friuli (796), 129; Gentilia-
 cum (767), 127; Guastalla
 (1106), 263; Höchst (1024),
 185; Hohenaltheim (916),
 175; Ingelheim (948), 176;
 Kiercy (849), 203; Kiercy
 (853), 204; Kiercy (857),
 163; Laugres (859), 205;
 Lateran (649), 9; Lavaur
 (1368), 542; Lerida (1229),
 306; Lestines (743), 78;
 Limoges (1031), 221; London
 (1166), 273; London (1175),
 328; Magdeburg (1261), 476;
 Mayence (829), 203; (847),
 203; (1259), 476; (1261), 314,
 344; Metz, (853), 167;
 Mellifont (1152), 303; Mont-
 pellier (1215), 399; Mousson
 181; Narbonne (1235), 400;
 Orleans (511), 38; Paris
 (825), 129; (829), 159; (865),
 168; (1209), 428; Pavia (698),
 87; (962), 178; (997), 182;
 (1022), 185; (1046), 187;
 (1160), 270; Piacenza (1095),
 245, 261; Pistres, (862), 166;
 Poitiers (1100), 332; Pra-
 gation (876), 171; Prague
 (1389), 499; Ravenna (1014),
 184; Ratisbon (792), 131,
 Rheims 180; (991), 163;
 (1148), 376; Rome (495),
 294; (732), 14; (748), 81;
 (799), 132; (863), 223; (869),
 225; (898), 173; (963), 178;
 (1047), 187; (1049), 249;
 (1060), 220; (1070), 255;
 (1075), 257 (1076, the Prin-

- ces'), 259; Salamanca (1310), 454; Savonnières (859), 205; Schleswig (1222) 316; Sens (1111), 268; Soissons (744), 79, 81; (853), 166; (860), 166; (866), 167; (1092), 373; Straneshalch (664), 52; Sutri (1046), 187; Toledo (1229), 335; Toulouse (1160), 270; (1229), 395; Tours (1163), 270; Tribur (895), 175, 219; Troyes (1128), 356; Trèves (1221), 323; Toucy (860), 205; Valence, 205; Verneuil 101; Verbery, 166; Winchester, 260; Würzburg, 312.
- Synodal Court, Episcopal 114, 217.
- Synodal Witnesses, 218.
- Symeon, 27; the Bulg., 133, 147; Metaphrastes, 236; Symmachus, 35.
- Taborites, 511, 548.
- Talavera, 546.
- Tancheim, 384.
- Tancred, 246.
- Tarasius, 16, 24.
- Tarik, 43.
- Temple, Order of the, 356, 451 sqq.
- Ternujin, 551.
- Tertiaries, 410. sqq.
- Testaments, 313.
- Thaddæus of Suessa, 284.
- Thalassius, 23.
- Thedald, 258.
- Theodelinde, 41.
- Theodoric, 35; of Friburg, 469; of Niem, 286, 505.
- Theodo of Bavaria, 60.
- Theodore, Pope, 86; of Antioch, 237; Balsamon 440; of Canterbury, 116; Paulician, 27; Studita, 17, 21, 24; of Tarsus, 53.
- Theodora, 173; Empress, 17.
- Theodosius, 32; of Ephesus, 14; Theodotus Cassitera, 16.
- Theodulf, 124.
- Theopempt,
- Theophanes of Nicæa, 19.
- Theophilus, 17.
- Theophylact (of Tusculum), 184; of Achrida, 440.
- Theodolf of Orleans, 160.
- Theudas, 40.
- Theudelinde, 84.
- Thietberga, 166 sqq.
- Thietgaud of Trèves, 167.
- Thietmar of Prague, 147.
- Thomas Aquinas, 330, 340, 412, 415, 429 sq., 464; Becket, 272 sqq.; Bradwardina, 564; Cantipratensis, 423; Celano, 412; a Kempis, 502; Morus, 536; of Neo Casarea, 28; of Stibny, 497; de Vio (Cajetanus), 530.
- Thorwald Kodranssen, 141.
- Thondrakians, 237.
- Timurlenk, 552.
- Tithe, 106, 487; right of, 309.
- Titus, Paulician, *Toumischerren*, 354.
- Toll, 651.
- Tolomeo of Lucca, 464.
- Transubstantiation, 327.
- Trithemius, 545.
- Trudpert, 69.
- Tryphon, 231.
- Tuotilo, 214.
- Tusculum, Count of, 186.
- Typos, the, of 648 9.
- Ubertino de Casale, 455.
- Ugolino, 407.
- Uldia, 31 sq.
- Ulrich of Augsburg, 210, 217; Molitoris, 543.
- Uktion, Extreme, 331.
- Ung Kian, 551.
- Union, Attempts at, 442, 550.
- Universities, 423 sqq.; foundation of, 407.
- Unni of Bremen, 140.
- Unwan, 141.
- Urban II., 245, 261, 322, 343; III., 274; IV., 279, 285, 329; V., 450, 491; VI., 479.
- Urbanistesses, 407.
- Uroif, 143.
- Usuardus, 216.
- Utraquists, 513, 548.
- Vacantia, 487.
- Valdes, 391.
- Valens, 32.
- Valentinus, 156.
- Vandals, 33.
- Venantius Fortunatus, 71.
- Verdun, Treaty of, 156.
- Vespers, Sicilian, 27.
- Vicelin, 362 sq.
- Victor II., 250; III., 245, 261; IV., Antipope, 270; of Capua, 211.
- Victorines, 318.
- Vicentius Bellovac, 429; Ferrér, 540.
- Vinnias, 115.
- Virgil of Salzburg, 98.
- Vitalian, 52.
- Vivilo of Passau, 76.
- Vladimir the Great, 153.
- Volkmar of Trèves, 274.
- Volquin, 366.
- Ulfia, *vid.* Ulfia.
- Wala of Corbie, 197.
- Walfried Strabo, 195.
- Waldenses, 391 sqq., 547 sq.
- Wallia, 33.
- Waldebert, 70.
- Waldrada, 167.
- Walter the Penniless, 246; of London, 322; Brute, 496; Mapes, 392; of Mortaigne, 379; of S. Victor, 379.
- Wamba, 42.
- Warin of Corvey, 202.
- Wazo of Liège, 249, 402.
- Wenzel, Emperor, 506.
- Wenzeslav, 147.
- Werner of Ellerbach, 324.
- Wittin, monk, 195.
- Wiebert, *vid.* Gilbert.
- Wibert of Ravenna, 257.
- Wiebert, 64.
- Wiching, 145.
- Wiclif, 490 sqq., 505.
- Widger of Ravenna, 186.
- Wido, *vid.* also Guido, of Milan, 253, 255; of Spoleto, 172.
- Widukind, 95.
- Wilfrid, 63 sq.
- William of Auvergne, 432; Champeaux, 318, 374; Conches, 377; the Conqueror, 260; the Goldsmith, 426; of Hirschau, 346; of Holland, 384; of Mayence, 177; of Modena, 366 sq.; of Nogaret, 291; Occum, 458, 463, 466 sqq.; of Paris, 341; du Plessis, 291; of Ruysbroek, 551; of St. Amour, 414; II., of Sicily 274.
- Willehad, 68, 97.
- Willerich, 97.
- Willibrord, 62, 64 sqq.
- Willigis of Mayence, 181.
- Wilsnack, miracle of, 544.
- Wimpfeling, 529.
- Wimbercht, 74.
- Windesheim, Congregation of 500.
- Winfrid, *vid.* Bonifatius.
- Winklers, 547.
- Wintan, 77.
- Witbald of Eichstadt, 77.
- Witches, belief in, 544; Hammer of, 545; trials of, 544.
- Witiza, 43.
- Witnesses, synodal, 218.
- Witold of Lithuania, 521.
- Wittmar of Corvey, 138.
- Wladislaw of Bohemia, 526.
- Wolfgang, Missionary, 151; of Ratisbon, 210.
- Wolfhard of Herrieden, 216.
- Worms, Laws of, 282.
- Worship, divine, 112.
- Würzburg, bishopric, 77.
- Wulfaich, 67.
- Ximenes, 546.
- Xiphilinus, *vid.* Johannes.
- Zacharias, Pope, 79, 82, 89.
- Zeit, Bishopric, 148.
- Ziska, 511.
- Zonaras, *vid.* Johannes.

ERRATA.

- Page 63, line 1 from top, for Cimibert read Cunibert.
- " 75, " 6 from top, for Luitprand read Liutprand.
- " 85, " 3 from foot, for *οικουμενος* read *οικουμενικός*.
- " 210, " 4 from foot, for Arno read Anno.
- " 245, " 9 from top, for Almoravids read Almoravides.
- " " 19 from top, for Almohads read Almohades.
- " " 5 from bottom, for Ghasnavids read Ghasnavides.
- " 283, " 16 from top, for monks read friars.



48117. HEcl. M.
Author Moeller, Wilhelm.

Title History of the Christian Church. Vol. 2.
Middle Ages.

DATE

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

Do not
remove
the card
from this
Pocket.

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

